MARXISM–LENINISM

ON WAR AND ARMY

SHOUT
SHARE
IT

MARXISM–LENINISM ON WAR AND ARMY

Progress Publishers

Moscow

Translated from the Russian by DONALD DANEMANIS
Designed by VICTOR KUZYAKOV

МАРКСИЗМ ЛЕНИНИЗМ О ВОЙНЕ И АРМИИ

На английском языке

С-88К23

First printing 1972

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION 9

Chapter One WAR AS A SOCIO POLITICAL PHENOMENON 13

1 *War and Politics* 15
Essence of War as a Socio Historical Phenomenon War as a Special State of Society The Role of Politics in Preparing and Unleashing the War The Role of Politics in the Conduct of the War Feedback Effect of the War on Politics

2 *Politics and Thermonuclear War* 34
The Constant and the Changeable in the Interrelation Between Politics and War Distortion of the Essence of Thermonuclear War by Bourgeois Philosophy and Sociology On the Essence of the Possible Nuclear Missile War

3 *The Economic Foundation of Wars* 47
The Economic Roots of Wars Under Capitalism Reasons of the Greater Aggressiveness of the Imperialist States Today Socio Economic Conditions for the Establishment of Peace

4 *War and Ideology* 57
Historical Place and Role of Ideology in Wars Bourgeois Views on the Role of Ideology in Modern War Attitude to War of Communist and Bourgeois Ideology

5 *Modern Bourgeois Theories About the Causes Essence and Role of Wars in History* 67
The Theory of Violence The Saving of Civilisation Theory Racialist and Chauvinist Views on the Sources and Nature of Wars Cosmopolitanism. Malthusianism on the Sources and Purpose of Wars Geopolitics on the Sources and Essence of Wars Psychological Theory on the

Essence and Sources of Wars Clerical Conceptions About the Origins of Wars

Chapter Two THE SOCIAL CHARACTER AND TYPES OF WARS IN THE CONTEMPORARY EPOCH 86

1 *Just and Unjust Wars Types of Wars* 86
The Social Character of War Objective Criterion of the Social Characteristic of Wars Attitude of Marxist Parties Towards Just and Unjust Wars Social Basis for the Classification of Wars into Types

2 *Wars Between Opposing Social Systems* 98
Social Character of the World War Under Preparation by the Imperialists The World War and the Socialist Revolution

3 *Civil Wars Between the Proletariat and the Bourgeoisie Between the People and the Reactionary Forces of Monopoly Capital* 107
Socialist Revolution and Civil War Main Kinds of Civil Wars Social and Strategic Specifics of Civil War Civil Wars and Armed Interventions by Imperialists

4 *Wars Between the Colonialists and the Peoples Fighting for Their Independence* 115
Social Forces of the National Liberation Struggle Wars of Oppressed Peoples for State Independence Wars of the Newly Independent States Against Imperialist Aggressors

5 *Wars Between Capitalist States* 122
Wars of the Imperialist Powers for World Domination The Possibility of New Wars Between Bourgeois States

6 *The Role of the Popular Masses in Wars in the Modern Epoch* 130
Main Facts Determining the Growing Role of the Masses in Wars The Masses in Just Wars The Masses in Unjust Wars Role of the Masses in the Face of the Threat of a New World War

Chapter Three WARS IN DEFENCE OF THE SOCIALIST MOTHERLAND 143

1 *Armed Defence of the Socialist Motherland a Regularity of the Revolutionary Transition from Capitalism to Socialism* 143
The Socialist Motherland and Its Distinctive Features The Threat of Military Attacks by Imperialists and Necessity for the Armed Defence of the Socialist Motherland

2 *Political Content and Specific Features of War in Defence of the Socialist Motherland* 152
Unconditional Justness of Wars in Defence of the Socialist Motherland Revolutionary Character of Wars in Defence of Socialism Wars in Defence of the Socialist Motherland Are Peoples Wars Internationalist Character of Wars in Defence of the Socialist Motherland

3 *Defence of the Gains of Socialism and Communism by the States of the Socialist Community* 161
Historico Conditioned Nature of the Defence of the Social ist Motherland Defence of the Socialist Countries in Modern Conditions

4 *Role of the Marxist Leninist Party in the Armed Defence of the Socialist Motherland* 169
Leadership by the CPSU of the Defence of Socialism Main Directions of the Party s Leadership of the Defence of the Socialist Country International Importance of the CPSU s Experience in Defending the Socialist Motherland

Chapter Four THE ARMED FORCES OF THE CAPITAL IST COUNTRIES SPECIFIC FEATURES OF THE ARMILS OF THE YOUNG NATIONAL STATES 187

1 *The Social Nature and the Purpose of the Armies of Exploiter States* 188
The Origin and Class Essence of the Army Social Func tions of the Armed Forces of the Capitalist States Inten sification of the Reactionary Role of the Bourgeois Army Under Imperialism

2 *The Armed Forces of Modern Imperialist States Aggres sive Military Political Blocs* 195
Attempts to Resolve Modern Contradictions by New Meth ods Contradictions Arising During the Formation of Mass Imperialist Armies Reactionary and Aggressive Trends in the Training and Education of the Imperialist Armies Aggressive Essence of the Military Political Imperialist Blocs Constant Threat to Peace by Imperialist Armies and Military Blocs

3 *The Armed Forces of the Young National States* 210
Armies Born During the Struggle for National Liberation Specifics of Their Formation.

Chapter Five THE ARMED FORCES OF THE SOCIALIST STATES 218

1 *Social Nature and the Purpose of the Army of a Socialist State* 218
Historical Purpose of the Armies of Socialist States Main Distinguishing Features of the Armies of Socialist States Moral Political Make up of the Armies of Socialist States

2 *Foundations and Principles Underlying the Development of the Soviet Armed Forces* 228
Correlation of the Foundations and Principles of the Armed Forces Development Socio Political Principles Organisational Principles The Principles of Education and Training

3 *The Armed Forces of the Socialist Countries* 253
Specific Features in the Formation and Development of an Army of a New Type Development of the Armies of the Socialist States Today

4 *Material and Spiritual Bases of the Supremacy of the Socialist Military Organisation* 268
Objective Prerequisites for the Supremacy of the Socialist Military Organisation Subjective Conditions for the Realisation of the Advantages of Socialism in the Interests of Victory

Chapter Six THE MILITARY POWER OF THE STATE IN CONTEMPORARY CONDITIONS 275

1 *The Concept of the State's Military Power* 275
Dependence of the Course and Outcome of Wars on the Military Power of the Warring Sides Causes of Changes in the Military Power of States

2 *Economic Foundations of the State's Military Power* 284
Dependence of the Course and Outcome of Wars on Economic Conditions Role of the Economy in Modern War Economic Potential Advantages of Socialist States in Utilising the Economic Potential

3 *Science and the Military Power of States* 297
Character and Ways of the Influence of Science on Military Affairs The Scientific Potential and the Conditions Determining Its Development

4 *Moral Political Basis of the State's Military Power* 310
Moral Potential and Moral Factor Content and Structure of the Moral Factor Increasing Role of the People's Moral Forces in Modern Wars

Chapter Seven. MILITARY POTENTIAL 323

1 *The Modern Revolution in Military Affairs and Its Influence on the Military Potential* 324
Causes and Essence of the Revolution in Military Affairs. Main Features of the Modern Revolution in Military Affairs Influence of the Revolution in Military Affairs on the Military Power of States and on the Military Potential

2 *Material and Technical Elements of the Armed Forces Combat Power* 338
Evolution of the Army's Technical Equipment. Fire and Mobility the Main Elements of the Combat Power of Troops in Technical Respects Strength of Troops Organisation of Troops. Training Standard of Troops Commanding Personnel.

3 *Moral Elements of the Troops Combat Power* 350
Specifics of the Army's Morale. Specific Features of the Influence Exerted by the Combat Situation on the Morale of Troops Moral Psychological Training of Troops on a Scientific Basis

4 *Development and Change of Warfare Methods* 364
Conditions Determining the Development and Change in Methods of Warfare. Influence of Social Revolution on Methods of Warfare. The Changes and Upheavals in Methods of Fighting a Result of the Progress of Military

Equipment. The Role of Military Theory in Working Out the Forms and Methods of Armed Struggle.

Chapter Eight THE MARXIST LENINIST TEACHING ON WAR AND METHODOLOGICAL PROBLEMS OF SOVIET MILITARY THEORY 377

1 *Dialectical Materialism the Universal Method of Cognition and Revolutionary Action Its Application in Soviet Military Theory* 378
Relation of Marxist Philosophy to Science and Practice The Application of Philosophy in Military Science and the Philosophical Problems of the Latter The Universal Method of Cognition and Its Application in Military Affairs

2 *Methodological Functions of the Marxist Leninist Teaching on War and the Army* 387
Importance of the Basic Propositions of the Marxist Leninist Teaching on War and the Army The Marxist Leninist Teaching on War and the Army and Soviet Military Doctrine. The Marxist Leninist Teaching on War and the Army and Soviet Military Science. Creative Character of Soviet Military Science

3 *The Problem of the Laws of Military Science and the Principles of Military Art* 399
The Objective Nature and Relative Independence of the Laws of Armed Struggle. The Type of the Laws of Armed Struggle. Historical Character of the Action and Cognition of the Laws of Armed Struggle. Mechanism of Action and Utilisation of the Laws of Armed Struggle Principles of Military Art.

CONCLUSION 417

CHRONOLOGY OF WARS ARMED UPRISINGS AND MILITARY CONFLICTS (FROM THE END OF THE 19th CENTURY) 420

INTRODUCTION

Historical development is a complex and contradictory process The new is born and asserts itself in bitter struggle against the old, which strives to hold its ground, to perpet uate its existence The reactionary imperialist circles headed by the US monopolists, do all they can to hold back the inexorable course of history They are willing to commit the most hideous crimes against humanity, even to resort to nuclear war in the attempt to resolve the basic contradiction of today the contradiction between socialism and capi talism

For two reasons the question of war and peace has become particularly urgent in modern conditions First, because im perialism has grown more aggressive, it does not shrink from direct armed struggle against socialism The imperial ists, notably the US imperialists, are stepping up the arms race, are attempting to put new life into the military blocs created by them, stir up local wars, use all and every means to suppress the national liberation movement, wage a pred atory war against the peoples of Vietnam, Laos and Cam bodia The second reason is that there has been an enormous qualitative leap in the development of weapons in the post war years In the event of a new world war the use of nuclear missiles may inflict enormous losses on mankind and cause unheard of destruction

So long as imperialism continues to exist and the forces of social progress are faced by aggressive forces, there will be radically different views about the nature of wars, about their causes, and about their role in social development

The Marxist Leninist teaching on war and the army is a harmonious sociological teaching on the origin and the essence of war, on the character and types of wars, on their origin in the contemporary epoch, on the regularities and factors determining the course and outcome of the war, on the attitude towards it of various strata of society, and on the social nature and purpose of the army A special place in this teaching is held by problems of abolishing wars from the life of society, and the defence of the achievements of socialism, the freedom and independence of peoples This teaching serves as the basis of Soviet military theory and practice

The basic principles of the teaching on war and the army were worked out by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels and were developed by Lenin The founder of the first socialist state in the world raised this teaching to a new level Relying on Lenin's heritage, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) has consistently developed the teaching on war and the army, improved it, and adapted it to the changing conditions, taking into account the alignment of forces at the various stages of social development, and the objective trends of the historical process At the same time the CPSU highly values the achievements other Marxist Leninist Parties have made in developing this teaching, takes them into account and uses them in its theoretical and practical work aimed at the defence of the socialist motherland

The method of dialectical materialism makes it possible to foresee the future scientifically and to make a sociological study of general military problems This is of first class importance if we are to solve the pressing problems of war and peace, to develop and strengthen the armed forces of the socialist state

Marxists Leninists rely on the principles of Marxism Leninism and use the dialectic materialist method in their struggle against imperialist ideologists and against revisionism and dogmatism, in resolving the most important questions of the modern teaching on war and the army

The indubitable merit of Marxist Leninist theory is that, on the basis of a comprehensive research into the main tendencies of social life today, it has revealed the deep roots of military clashes and also the objective possibilities of avert

ing wars, and shows us the forces capable of coping with that task

Naturally, imperialism has remained reactionary and continues to be a source of aggression and aggressive wars But its potential has greatly decreased, its strength has relatively diminished and its internal contradictions have taken on sharper forms At the same time forces have emerged that are able to oppose imperialism It has now become possible to avert a world war and, in certain conditions, also local wars This conclusion is founded on a scientific analysis of the specific features of the present period and on an evaluation of the correlation of the social forces in the world

Yet, the possibility of imperialism unleashing new wars. including a world nuclear war, must not be discounted The war of aggression waged by the USA in Vietnam, the Israeli aggression against the freedom loving Arab peoples which was prepared by imperialism, and other manifestations of the reactionary essence of imperialism, and also the policy and ideology of anti communism, are striking testimony

In modern conditions the struggle against reactionary ideology must be pursued with even greater determination than before Despite the great variety of conceptions and viewpoints on war and peace, imperialist ideologists are unanimous on cardinal issues They have a common "ideological platform" anti communism, a common philosophical and methodological basis idealism and metaphysics, a common morality misanthropy The idea that wars are eternal and unavoidable permeates all of bourgeois ideology, there is a difference only in the arguments they use to put this view across, and in the degree of frankness with which they admit to this

A more vigorous struggle should be waged against the anti Marxist views disseminated by the Chinese leaders on questions of war and peace Using "Left" phrases, they speak of the inevitability and even the desirability of military conflicts, including a world nuclear war

The Marxist Leninist teaching on war and the army exposes all anti scientific, reactionary views on that problem, helps to work out a correct attitude towards war, reveals the sources of military conflicts and shows the forces able to avert them

This teaching differs fundamentally from pacifist views

on wars Pacifists do not link their negative attitude to war with the struggle against its main source the capitalist system Marxists Leninists draw strength from the fact that they link the struggle to prevent war, the struggle for universal security and a checking of aggressors, with the fight for the revolutionary transformation of society, for social progress

That teaching shows the fundamental difference between just and unjust wars, progressive and reactionary ones Just, progressive wars are aimed at liberating peoples from national and class oppression, at defending the national and state independence of the socialist and developing countries, of all peace loving peoples Unjust, reactionary wars are waged by aggressors for the purpose of subjugating other peoples, of seizing territories and plundering national wealth, of depriving the working people of their social gains

The Marxist Leninist teaching on war and the army lays the theoretical foundation for the most effective ways and means of averting wars today and of creating conditions making them impossible in future

All these questions are looked into in this book It gives a systematic exposition of the Marxist Leninist teaching on war and the army, reveals the essence of wars and their origin, the character and types of wars, the social nature and purpose of the army, the foundations of the military might of a state and its armed forces, and the essence of the modern revolution in military affairs

Much space is given to such problems as war between opposing social systems, the social forces of the national liberation struggle, the role of the masses in modern wars, the causes of the unrestrained arms race in the imperialist camp, war in defence of the young independent states and the socialist countries

Since the defensive might of the Soviet Union and the whole of the socialist community checks imperialist aggressive designs and serves as a reliable means of preserving and consolidating universal peace, the book deals with the ways and means of strengthening that might, their combat readiness to foil and rebuff imperialist aggression At the same time it criticises anti Marxist theories and reactionary views on military questions, the struggle against which promotes the cause of peace and social progress

Chapter One

WAR AS A SOCIO-POLITICAL PHENOMENON

The history of class society abounds in military clashes and conflicts. In the past 5,500 years mankind was plunged into war more than 14,000 times. In the first half of this century alone there were two destructive world wars. All social progress in antagonistic formations brings bloodshed and suffering to the people. In the words of Marx, this progress was like a "hideous pagan idol, who would not drink the nectar but from the skulls of the slain".[1]

But, wars are no fatal inevitability in human social development, they are a socio-historical phenomenon. There was a time when people did not know wars, and a time will come when wars will have been done away with once and for all.

As all socio-historical phenomena, the emergence of wars, their nature and place in history are subject to the laws of social development revealed by Marxism-Leninism.

As distinct from pre-Marxist theories and the anti-scientific views of modern bourgeois ideologists, the founders of Marxism proved that the history of society is a logical, natural process. It is based on the historically determined nature and level of development of the social productive forces. The objective relations of production, which do not depend on the will of people, and which in their aggregate comprise the social system, are built on this material foun-

[1] K. Marx and F. Engels, *On Britain*, Moscow, 1962, p. 406.

dation The character of the social contradictions and the way in which they are resolved depend on economic relations The economic system ultimately determines all social, political and ideological relations, including also the conditions for the emergence of wars

In class society war has become a means of resolving the antagonistic contradictions of social development

The armed clashes between primeval tribes were a sideline occupation, an aspect of the labour process, admittedly a unique one, directed at the seizure of hunting grounds, pastures, etc Marx characterised the armed struggle of primeval tribes as a great *common effort*, directed at the solution of the common task of seizing objective subsistence conditions, at their preservation and protection All the male members of the tribal group, sometimes also the women, had to participate in this "war" All able bodied members participated in "combat" with their instruments of labour, their hunting weapons, since at that time these were the only instruments used in the struggle for existence Armed clashes often ended in the destruction of some tribes, but never in their enslavement Prisoners were not made slaves They were either eaten, or became fully fledged members of the victorious tribe At that stage there were as yet no social forces to organise and conduct wars so as to achieve definite economic and political aims There was also no special organisation of armed people, as there were no special arms for fighting

Hence, *the armed clashes of primeval tribal groups and clans, who did not know private ownership and division into classes, were not wars in the real sense of the word*

The point is that war has two organically interrelated aspects the socio political and the military technical The first expresses the social, class nature of war, its political essence, the second characterises the specifics of the war, of the armed struggle In using the term "war" to designate armed clashes in pre class society, Marx and Engels referred to the second aspect Clashes between tribes are reminiscent of wars in exploiter societies only by their second aspect.

War emerged as a socio political phenomenon at a definite stage of social development, namely, with the disintegration of the primeval system and the emergence of the slave owning mode of production, when private ownership of the means of production appeared, when society was

divided into antagonistic classes, and the state emerged Private property bred social violence The exploiter classes legalised organised armed struggle aimed at winning material gains, enslaving people and enhancing the economic and political rule of those classes

Exposing the vulgar "force theory", Engels showed that it was not war that had given rise to property inequality and classes, but, on the contrary, that private ownership and the division of society into classes had transformed the armed clashes of primeval tribes into war as a socio political phenomenon Only then did wars become a constant venture of the exploiters

Thus, *as a socio historical phenomenon, serving the political aims of definite classes, war first emerged in exploiter society, it is the product and constant concomitant of class antagonistic society*

1 WAR AND POLITICS

Wars are unlike one another because there is a difference in the historical conditions in which they break out, in their causes, aims and results Wars also differ from one another as regards military equipment, the methods of struggle, territorial scale and duration, the number of battles and campaigns, victories and defeats Yet, despite these differences, wars are always a cruel form for the resolution of social antagonisms While unjust, aggressive wars served and continue to serve as a means of attaining the predatory economic and reactionary political aims of the exploiting classes, just wars of liberation are a counter measure, i e , they are waged to repel the armed violence of exploiters against the working people, that of foreign invaders, or that of colonialists against enslaved peoples Hence, the political, social and economic aims pursued in these wars are just and noble, while the armed violence is legitimate, justified.

It is for this reason that the bourgeois ideologists do all they can to confuse and distort the question about the sources of wars, their nature, social and class essence They consider them in isolation from the conditions of capitalist development, the economic relations and policies of the exploiter classes, conceal who is responsible for imperialist

aggression They want to make the working people recon cile themselves with the horrors of war, to paralyse their will to struggle for peace and to prevent wars

The interests of peace, of the people and of social progress demand that bourgeois lies and slander be exposed, that a correct scientific understanding be gained, first and foremost, of the nature of war and of its class, political essence

Essence of War as a Socio Historical Phenomenon

"With reference to wars," Lenin wrote, "the main thesis of dialectics is that *'war is simply the continuation of politics by other* (i e, violent) *means*' Such is the formula of Clausewitz, one of the greatest writers on the history of war, whose thinking was stimulated by Hegel And it was always the standpoint of Marx and Engels, who regarded *any* war as the *continuation* of the politics of the powers concerned and the *various classes* within these countries in a definite period "[1]

We see that in expounding the essence of war, Lenin refers to Clausewitz (1780 1831) And this is only logical, for Clausewitz's research into the relation of war to politics and his formula about war being a continuation of politics by violent means were an indubitable contribution to the development of military thought of that time

It would, however, be a gross error to think that the views on the essence of war held by Marxism Leninism are identical with those propounded by Clausewitz On the contrary, there is a fundamental difference between them, which is expressed notably in their understanding of politics, of its class nature

Clausewitz said that politics represents the interests of society as a whole, he denied its class nature Accordingly he propounded a false, idealistic view of politics, which he called the mind of the personified state Besides, Clausewitz understood by politics only foreign policy, and ignored the fact that war is first and foremost a continuation of domestic policy, which expresses the class structure of society most directly Clausewitz had in mind only the politics of the state, that is, of the class dominant in the state in question He did not believe that when the oppressed classes were

[1] V I Lenin *Collected Works*, Vol 21 p 219

fighting against the exploiters, they were thereby pursuing a policy of their own, and he therefore did not extend the concept of war to the civil wars of the popular masses against the exploiter classes and their state Clausewitz completely ignored the fact that politics is conditioned by deep causes rooted in the economic system of society

What, then, is politics from a Marxist Leninist viewpoint? It is, first and foremost, the relations between classes Politics is not simply the activity of governments, the state apparatus and parties Politics embraces the aggregate relations of huge masses of people, of thousands and hundreds of millions of people, composing the various classes

Class distinctions have their roots in the mode of production, and it is the latter that determines the nature of each class, its interests, its historical fate, and at the same time the political relations between classes that is, the relations which in one way or another concern the state the decisive instrument of the ruling class While the state power is in the hands of a given class, that class directs its efforts towards securing the stability of the economic basis on which its rule is built This makes the question of state power the key question of the class struggle Politics is the struggle of classes for the preservation and consolidation of the obtaining state system or for its overthrow It is guided and controlled by definite parties, and the policies of the ruling class are implemented mainly by the state bodies that are assigned the task of defending the ruling class's fundamental interests, conditioned by its economic position

The fundamental and long range interests of a definite class are fully reflected in its politics (notably in the politics of its leading party and the state) In this sense politics is a generalisation of the economy, its concentrated expression That is why political relations, politics, play the main role in the clashes between social forces, in the struggle of classes, states and international coalitions

From the Marxist Leninist viewpoint the central question in any analysis and evaluation of a war is that of its sociopolitical nature To understand the socio political nature of war is to reveal its class essence, to establish that the war aims are subordinated to the economic and political interests of the warring classes and states

The Marxist Leninist proposition on the class nature of politics, the continuation of which is war, is crucial to any understanding of the essence of war This, in fact, constitutes the fundamental difference between the Marxist Leninist view on war and the doctrines of bourgeois ideologists, who try hard to conceal the links between the politics which lead to war and the interests of definite classes

Bourgeois sociologists, historians and military theoreticians who share Clausewitz's view and see war as a continuation of politics, generally refer only to foreign policy, isolating it from domestic policy This viewpoint was actively propagandised also by the leaders of the Second International (Kautsky, for example), and is now being spread by the Right Socialist leaders This is done in order to gloss over the class sources of the wars conducted by aggressive imperialist states The class content of the domestic policy of these states is generally clearer to the broad mass of the working people, than is foreign policy, which is kept secret (especially the content of military pacts and treaties, providing for the unleashing of predatory wars), and about which the mass of the people generally knows little

There are no two isolated kinds of policies foreign and domestic Every state pursues a single policy, expressing the fundamental and long range interests of the ruling class, and in socialist society the interests of the whole people Foreign and domestic policies are two aspects of the same policy Hence, to examine the essential nature of war a study must be made of the aggregate politics of the given classes and their states

Domestic policy expresses the class nature of the state and the interests of the ruling classes directly Hence, the nature of the foreign policy is generally determined by the domestic policy As is the domestic policy of a state, so, in the main, is also its foreign policy This proposition is important to an understanding of wars It has long since been observed in history, Lenin wrote, that " the character of a war and its success depend chiefly upon the internal regime of the country that goes to war war is a reflection of the internal policy conducted by the given country before the war" [1]

The dependence of foreign policy on domestic policy must

[1] V I Lenin *Collected Works*, Vol 30, p 152

not be understood as absolute All policies, domestic and foreign, are conditioned by the economic and state system of the society in question, by its class structure, and the importance of this or that aspect of the state's policies changes in keeping with concrete historical conditions During wars and on their eve foreign policy generally becomes decisively important to domestic policy Foreign policy plays a particularly important role during world wars, when the fate of nations is in the balance

The class character of politics determines also the class nature of war Lenin wrote "War is a continuation of policy by other means All wars are inseparable from the political systems that engender them The policy which a given state, a given class within that state, pursued for a long time before the war is inevitably continued by that same class during the war, the form of action alone being changed"[1]

Thus, war cannot be understood without first understanding its connection with the policies preceding it, without a study of the policies pursued by two warring sides long before the war War is the continuation of politics by violent means It is an implementation of politics by armed struggle, and its main feature At the same time not all armed struggle should be considered war Without a political aim even the fiercest struggle will not be a war, but simply a fight The political interests of the classes at war and of their states determine the war *aims*, while armed struggle is the *means* of achieving these aims Together they comprise the essential aspects of war as a social phenomenon *The essence of war, that is, the decisive feature that expresses its nature, i e, its qualitative difference from the peaceful state of society, is that war is the continuation of the politics of definite classes and states (coalitions) by violent means*

The Marxist Leninist definition of war, reflecting the practical experience of the progressive social forces, their attitude to war, is of great theoretical and practical importance

Since war is a special form of political action, which is linked with the whole system of social relations, the class contradictions racking antagonistic society in peacetime do not disappear during war, and class struggle does not give

[1] V I Lenin *Collected Works*, Vol 24 p 400

way to "class peace", the struggle only changes its forms and purposes in connection with the advent of war Lenin wrote, that " the class contradictions dividing the nations continue to exist in wartime and manifest themselves in conditions of war" [1]

In our time this proposition acquires special importance in the struggle against the imperialists, who want to unleash another world war

War as a Special State of Society

War is a many faceted and complex socio political phenomenon To reveal the content of the concept "war" in full, means to elucidate the aggregate of social processes in which the essence of war is expressed in one way or another The experience of two world wars and other wars in our century shows that in the new historical conditions war, once it is unleashed, becomes a concern of all of society War most fully expresses all socio economic and political contradictions, the antagonisms between classes and the states conducting war These contradictions are manifest in all spheres of social life and presuppose the use of violent as well as of non violent means of policy making

It was shown above that the essence of war is the continuation of politics by means of armed force This is the main characteristic of war Therefore, this definition of the essence of war does not include many of the important ways that are used to secure victory in the war, notably economic, diplomatic and other forms of struggle The definition of the content of war and that of the forms holding and expressing this content are much more all embracing These definitions include a wide range of processes that are attending the armed struggle, are connected with it and serve to achieve the political aims of the war, the aim of gaining victory

A full description of the content of war must contain the aggregate of social processes which in one way or another express the essence of the war and form part of it. It is important to note that the experience of two world wars, and the other wars in our century, has shown that in contemporary historical conditions war has become a state embracing all of society War is a full and summary expression not only of one of contradictions but an expression

[1] V I Lenin, *Collected Works* Vol 21 p 40

of the entire aggregate of socio economic and political contradictions and antagonisms between the classes and states at war These contradictions come to the fore in all spheres of social life and presuppose the use of violent and non violent means of policy making

In peacetime the chief role is generally played by non violent means of policy making, while violent means do not assume the character of a large scale armed struggle, but in wartime the situation changes radically means of mass armed violence move to the foreground The political aim of classes and states is attained during the war predomi nantly by violent means Other means (non violent ones), become secondary, subordinate That is why armed strug gle is the decisive feature of war, its specific trait

With the outbreak of war all means of policy making are directed towards victory, towards achieving the political aims of the war They are not achieved by the armed forces alone Economic and ideological struggle, open and sec ret diplomacy, and other forms of struggle, are used not only to further the armed struggle but also to supplement it, and in aggregate with it they are able to break the will of the enemy to resist, and thus secure victory These are all means of waging war, its component parts

This aspect of war has been given attention by many prominent military leaders M N Tukhachevsky, analysing the experience of the Civil War, noted that war "is not exhausted by military operations The actions of the armed forces are supplemented by organised and combined pres sure and blows on all the fronts of the struggle (economic, political, etc) "[1]

Each of the above features of war expresses, in one way or another, the essence of war The armed struggle expresses it most directly In the economic, ideological and diplomatic struggle, the essence of war is manifested in the changes their aims and character undergo as soon as war breaks out, i e, when the aim of securing victory overshadows everything else Economic, ideological and diplomatic strug gle during the war differs substantially from the forms in which this struggle proceeds in peacetime

War, as a state of society, is not only a continuation

[1] M N Tukhachevsky *Izbranniye proizvedeniya* (*Selected Works*) Vol 2 Voyenizdat Moscow 1964 p 11

but also a summary expression of politics This is particu larly true of contemporary wars The main political aims of the ruling classes assume a concentrated expression in the political aims of the war The military, economic and moral political forces and potential of the ruling classes are con centrated on the achievement of these aims In unjust wars the ruling classes apply the machinery of coercion, deceit and misinformation to the full in order to make the mass of the people fight for interests alien to them In just wars, the people rally and give all their powers to gain victory over imperialist aggressors Contemporary wars involve not only the armed forces directly participating in military opera tions, but also the populations at large, as shown by the First and Second World Wars

All the above will apply to an even greater extent to nuc lear war, should it ever be allowed to come about Such a war should not be thought of as a gigantic technical enter prise alone as a launching of an enormous number of mis siles with nuclear warheads to destroy the vital objectives and manpower of the enemy, or as operations by the armed forces alone Nuclear war is a complex and many sided process, which in addition to the operation of the armed forces will involve economic, diplomatic and ideological forms of struggle They will all serve the political aims of the war and be guided by them

From the above we can draw the conclusion that *the con cept of war includes the entire activity a people carries on during a war to achieve victory* In accordance with the above, the concept of war includes a political aspect, armed struggle, that is, military operations on a varying scale, other kinds of activity carried on to ensure the achievement of the political aims of the war directly or through measures promoting the armed struggle economic, ideological, and also non military forms of political activity (diplomacy, the activities of parties, voluntary organisations, etc)

The *political aspect* of war is expressed in the character of the political aims set by the state or by a definite class They differ in different stages of historical development For example, the national bourgeois liberation movement formed the content of many wars in the 19th century At the turn of the century the redivision of the world became the con tent of imperialist wars

The political aspect of war can be similar on each side, as was the case, for example, during the First World War, but it can also be diametrically opposed, if the war is just on one side and unjust on the other It should also be taken into account that the political aims of war are very often of a complex, interwoven and contradictory character Defending opposing interests, each of the warring sides may enlist heterogeneous social forces, which will influence the policy of the ruling classes and lend specific features to the character of the war Modern wars draw into their orbit big coalitions of states, which may have not only different but even opposing socio economic systems (the anti fascist coali tion during the Second World War)

When at war, states pursue a specific foreign policy They wage diplomatic struggle to isolate the enemy, to weaken his links with other countries, to influence neutral countries in the interests of the coalition, etc A case in point was the setting up and consolidation of the anti Hitler coalition during the Second World War

The whole inner political life of countries changes sharply during the war For example, bourgeois democracy is further curtailed During unjust wars "reaction all along the line", typical of imperialism, and dictatorial tendencies are gener ally carried to extremes In some states, waging wars of liberation, the forms of the proletariat's class struggle and the tactics of the Communist Parties also undergo changes This happened during the Second World War in France, Greece and other countries In socialist society too social activity is directed at satisfying the needs of the front, at achieving victory

The political strivings of the class forces drawn into the struggle make up the political content of every single war This content reflects the main tendencies in the development of the class struggle, which determine the concrete specific features of the war in question These tendencies are, in fact, the element determining the content of the war

Armed struggle is the chief means, the specific element of war Even the chronological limits of the war are determined by the dates marking the beginning and the end of military action But armed struggle is politics through and through and cannot be isolated from it

The content of war includes also all other kinds of acti

vity, which are in one way or another linked with the armed struggle, supplement it, strengthen it, secure the possibility of conducting military operations, and directly or indirectly serve to attain the political aims of the war Economic activity, scientific development, ideological struggle all this is directed first and foremost at securing the victorious conduct and outcome of the armed struggle and ultimately at the attainment of the political aims of the war

All the material and spiritual forces of a people are mobilised for the war The economy is reorganised to be able to fulfil its new tasks of supplying everything that is needed to carry on the armed struggle Naturally, the reorganisation of the economy along military lines is carried out in a different way in capitalist and socialist countries, but it is done in both

The country's economy supplies the front with the necessary material means, military equipment and arms At the same time measures are taken to weaken the enemy economically by striking at his vital objectives, destroying his communications, enforcing blockades, etc

The trends of scientific development also change radically Science is to a high degree subordinated to the war needs Natural science helps to improve weaponry, to create new techniques, and also to preserve the health of the officers and men in the warring army, etc

Ideological struggle too becomes an instrument of war All its methods *don armour*, as it were, and begin to serve the interests of the war Oriented education is carried on to harden the will of the population and the troops for victory over the enemy, and at the same time everything is done to weaken the will of the enemy, to destroy his ability to wage war Naturally, the aims and methods used for this ideological influence differ fundamentally in capitalist and socialist countries

The Role of Politics in Preparing and Unleashing the War

Wars, as we have shown above, are rooted in the nature of class antagonistic formations As distinct from crises of overproduction, that shake the capitalist economy periodically, wars do not emerge spontaneously Crises are neither planned nor organised, nobody wants them or strives after them They befall people spontaneously, like unavoidable natural calamities

Undeniably, many wars in history did break out spontaneously This was true of most revolutionary uprisings and revolutionary wars of the past, when the mass of the people rose against its exploiters But wars fought by states do not emerge spontaneously This was true in the slave owning and feudal societies, and applies to an even higher degree to wars under capitalism

Wars unleashed by aggressive states are generally caused by various spontaneous processes, which assume so vast a scale that the countries concerned could neither foresee nor prevent them (financial crises and bankruptcies, uneven development of individual countries in economic respects and in world trade, rapid growth of the dissatisfaction of the people and adoption by them of revolutionary attitudes, etc) The results of these wars generally differ from the aims for which they were unleashed and are sometimes directly opposed to them This was characteristic of the last two world wars

Yet, wars were the most organised and purposeful undertakings spontaneously developing societies ever carried out Wars always demanded the overcoming to the maximum of social disorganisation and the suppression of spontaneity in the actions of large masses of people, and the subordination of these actions to a single guiding will Generally, aggressive wars of the exploiter classes are prepared in secret conclave, but they are prepared deliberately and systematically over decades, and are unleashed just as deliberately by their governments and parties, at a moment considered by them most opportune and suitable for the beginning of the long premeditated war These parties, state bodies and leaders are the instigators of the war, and the responsibility for it lies with them

Thus, *wars emerge neither spontaneously nor automatically They are deliberately prepared and unleashed by definite parties and governments of the imperialist states*

Owing to the specific features of the economic and political development of the aggressive, imperialist states, all recent wars and military conflicts have come about as a result of imperialist policy The war the USA wages in Indochina and Israeli aggression in the Middle East, are links in the chain of actions constituting in aggregate the policy of the

militant imperialist circles aimed at obstructing the historical advance of the cause of national independence, democracy and socialism

Preparations for war are conducted for a long time before the war breaks out and embrace many aspects of social life

Imperialist states engage first and foremost in the *military preparation* of the war they are plotting It consists in the formation and improvement of the armed forces, their equipment with modern weapons, the construction of all sorts of military bases, the working out of strategic plans, the organisation of espionage and subversive activity against the country that is to fall victim of their aggression

Diplomatic preparations are of great importance They serve to ensure the best possible alignment of the international forces in the coming war, to knock together aggressive blocs, to involve their enemies, and sometimes even their "friends" in international conflicts and wars, in order to make them, once they have exhausted their strength, follow in the political wake of the power in question

The imperialist states also carry on systematic *economic preparations* for wars, which have become particularly important in present day conditions These preparations involve the building of military plants and also the subordination of the economy to war needs already in peacetime At the same time huge amounts of strategic materials are stockpiled Research and design work is also made part of the war preparations

Changes take place in the inner political life of bourgeois countries the elementary democratic rights of the people are gradually abolished, dictatorial, fascist regimes of one form or another are set up, the state becomes a militaristic, military police state, militarisation embraces all aspects of bourgeois society

Finally, the imperialist states engage in intensified and systematic *ideological preparations* for new aggressive wars Their aims are twofold to conceal the true, i e, predatory, anti popular aims of the war being prepared by them, and to incite the peoples of the countries in the aggressive blocs against the peoples of the socialist and other peace loving countries

The deliberate way in which wars are prepared and un

leashed does not exclude the role of accidents which may become the *casus belli* Even though they are secondary, the role of such accidents may change in accordance with concrete historical conditions

Today two circumstances heighten the role of accidents in the outbreak of war

First, the tension in international relations which the aggressive circles in the imperialist states have for a long time been sustaining and heightening The "cold war" climate, the atmosphere of military psychosis and the fear of the "red danger" fabricated by the advocates of the "preemptive nuclear strike" against the socialist camp, all provoke the emergence of a state of affairs in which accidents can become a cause for the outbreak of war We must not exclude the possibility that people, able to provoke war by giving an adventurist order for a nuclear attack against the Soviet Union or some other country of the socialist community, may rise to the position of head of government or to one of military authority in some imperialist state

Secondly, the constantly growing nuclear missile stockpiles in the hands of the aggressive forces These weapons are generally ready for use and can be actuated automatically Despite various precautionary measures, there is no full guarantee that a technical error will not spark off a nuclear explosion In view of the tense political climate it may be wrongly interpreted and trigger off war This possibility becomes the greater, the more intricate modern weapons grow Besides, accidents can happen because of mistakes committed by the personnel servicing nuclear systems There may be people among them who suffer from mental disorders, are careless or pursue adventuristic designs Mistakes made by the US strategic air force or missile control, for example, mistakes in decoding radar device data are not excluded either

Most important, however, are not accidents but the objective tendency of the aggressive forces of imperialism to unleash wars However, this tendency is opposed by another, embodied in the powerful social forces fighting for the easing of international tension, against war and for social progress These forces are headed by the socialist camp with its enormous economic, moral, scientific and military potential The

further strengthening of the USSR and all socialist countries, the growth of the social forces fighting for the preservation and consolidation of peace, diminishes the possibility of a new world war being unleashed by the imperialists

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Communist and Workers' Parties in other socialist countries oppose the war mongering policy of US imperialism and pursue a policy aimed at consolidating all anti imperialist peace loving forces and fighting the forces of reaction and war At the same time the defence potential of the USSR and of the entire socialist community is being strengthened

The Role of Politics in the Conduct of the War

With the outbreak of war politics is not pushed to the background and is not subordinated fully to strategy, as the German militarists Helmuth von Moltke, von der Goltz and Erich von Ludendorff held to be the case, and many contemporary military leaders in the imperialist states still believe today

Politics plays the decisive role not only in the prepara tions for war but also in its conduct War, Lenin said, *is pur suit of the same old aims by the ruling classes using a different method*

The belligerents formulate the political aims of the war The nature of these political aims has a decisive impact both on the content and the conduct of the war

Politics determines the *priority* and strength of the blows inflicted on the enemy, the measures taken to strengthen allied relations within the coalition and the general strategic plan of the war, which is directed at the quickest possible rout of the enemy or at a drawn out struggle and the grad ual exhaustion of the enemy's forces At the same time politics, by taking into account the strategic possibilities at its disposal, must determine the speed and the intensity of the military actions, and also the forces and means it is necessary to mobilise in order to attain the aims intended, etc In doing so politics takes into account not only the aims of the war but also those of the post war settlement and subordinates the conduct of the war to the attainment of these aims

The solution of these questions, which is determined by the politics of the ruling classes, is of first class importance to the conduct of the armed struggle The belligerents solve

them in keeping with their political aims and with due consideration for the prevailing economic, national, geographic, military and other conditions

Thus, Britain was able for a long time to take advantage of her insular position and, by relying on her industrial and naval might and the material resources of her numerous colonies, to use other nations for her catspaw in almost all past wars She incited countries against each other, drew out the war to bleed them dry, in order herself to have fresh forces at the end of the war and thus to ensure for herself the hegemony in the post war period This policy defined the structure of the British armed forces (the priority given to the development of the navy) and British strategy

The British and US imperialists attempted to pursue a similar policy during the Second World War The aims of this policy were expressed by Harry Truman with cynical frankness on the third day after nazi Germany's invasion of the Soviet Union He said "If we see that Germany is winning we ought to help Russia and if Russia is winning we ought to help Germany and that way let them kill as many as possible "[1]

The political aims of Britain and the USA in the Second World War determined their strategy and hence the military operations of their armed forces The American and British imperialists delayed the opening of the second front in every way, nurtured plans of launching operations not in France, but in Italy and the Balkans These strategic aims determined also the methods and forms of the struggle of the Anglo American forces, the general method of their military operations their sluggishness, inertness and indecisiveness

Nazi Germany had entirely different political plans. and hence also pursued a different military strategy The German ruling circles attempted to rout their many enemies as quickly as possible since these had in aggregate a potential far greater than Germany Most of all they feared a war on two fronts against the Soviet Union and Western countries The German military doctrine therefore relied on the Blitzkrieg idea, on sudden destructive blows which were intended rapidly to rout Germany's enemies one by one without giving them time to mobilise and to apply their

[1] *The New York Times*, June 24 1941, p 7

resources This strategy relied on the use of sudden and rapid action

The strategic aims of the German imperialists determined the general character of the operations of the armed forces The nazi troops waged active offensive operations and this gave them major advantages in the beginning of the war, when their opponents had not yet had time to mobilise However, the adventurism of Hitler Germany's political and military strategic aims was one of the reasons for her complete collapse, her main armed forces were routed by the Soviet Army

Thus, through strategy, the politics of states at war exert a decisive impact on the nature, methods and forms of the armed struggle

The scale and intensity of wars are determined first of all by the political aims In the early Middle Ages wars were mainly waged to conquer territories and towns They therefore had a limited and local character and the comparatively rare wars were often waged indecisively Under imperialism, world wars have for the first time in history acquired a global scale all big powers are drawn into them

The fact that wars are fought on such a vast scale cannot be explained by the progress of military equipment alone, for this progress only opens up the possibility of waging the armed struggle on an extensive scale and of great intensity The scale of wars is determined primarily by the political aims of the belligerents Under new conditions the major imperialist states have begun to advance the aim of world domination in the wars unleashed by them "World domination is, to put it briefly, the substance of imperialist policy, of which imperialist war is the continuation,"[1] Lenin wrote This explains the fact that the armed clashes between imperialist powers grow into world wars

In determining their strategy during wars that are waged by coalitions, the states at war have to take into account also the politics and military strategic position of their allies

For example, the main aim of the Jassy Kishinev operation, carried out by the Soviet troops in August 1944, and of the advance through Rumania into Bulgaria, Hungary,

[1] V I Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol 23 p 35

Yugoslavia and Austria, was to break up the Hitler coalition, to help the peoples of Southeast and Central Europe free themselves from the fascist tyranny, to deprive the Germans of Rumanian oil and of the war industry concentrated in Hungary and Austria At the same time the operations of the Soviet troops nipped in the bud the schemes of the Anglo American imperialists to occupy the Balkan countries and to implant reactionary regimes in them by force of arms

In the course of the war against Japan the US political and military leaders, in direct contravention of the commitments adopted at the Yalta Conference, intended to occupy the ports of Dairen (Dalny) and Port Arthur, and also to seize and hold the Kuriles These schemes were foiled by the rapid and decisive actions of the Soviet Armed Forces the air landing in the Dalny and Port Arthur area and the amphibious operation on the Kuriles

Politics, directing the armed struggle in accordance with its aims, must take strict account of economic conditions and other aspects of social life This applies particularly to contemporary wars, in which all phenomena and processes are far more interlinked than they were in former wars

To illustrate this let us give the following example In August 1941 the bulk of the German armour, poised for attack on Moscow was, on Hitler's order, turned south to develop the offensive against the Ukraine This decision was prompted not only by tactical but also by economic considerations, by the endeavour to seize the industrial, raw material and food resources of the Ukraine and to occupy the Crimea in order to prevent it from being used as an "aircraft carrier of the Soviet Union" for air raids on the Balkan oil fields, and to deprive the USSR of access to the Caucasian oil

Thus, politics, taking into account the economic and other interests of the belligerents, have a decisive effect on the conduct of the armed struggle A clear and deep understanding of this proposition makes it possible to subordinate specific military considerations to the key objectives of the state, to adopt a scientific approach to the solution of intricate questions At the same time, Marxism Leninism warns against a dangerous separation, let alone break, between political considerations and military expediency *Conditions*

for the achievement of the set aims can be created only if a political approach to military problems is organically combined with an excellent knowledge and careful consideration of specific military conditions, and of the laws governing the conduct of the armed struggle

Feedback Effect of the War on Politics

War not only depends on politics, but is itself able to exert a major influence on it, to delay or to hasten the maturing of the social contradictions which impel the development of class society The fact that war affects social life does not run counter to the above statement that politics plays the decisive role in the preparation, unleashing and conduct of the war War has a very strong feedback effect on politics and greatly affects the external and internal relations of the belligerents

Being a continuation of politics, wars generate requirements which must be reckoned with This applies with special force to world wars, when enormous masses of people and collossal technical means are put into action

States drawn into a war are often compelled to re appraise some aspects of their policies, to adapt them to the new conditions and new tasks emerging in the course of the armed struggle Naturally, in so doing they do not reject their fundamental interests and basic aims On the contrary, with the outbreak of war and during it they change their policies so as to defend the interests and aims they are fighting for, in a different sequence and by other methods In the interaction of war and politics the decisive role always belongs to politics Thus, for example, the requirements of the armed struggle against nazi Germany and her satellites made Britain, and later the USA, join the USSR in the anti Hitler coalition and give the Soviet Union certain military assistance, chiefly by blockading Germany from the sea, bombing her industrial centres and communication junctures, and also by supplying the USSR with some strategic materials under the lend lease act At the same time the reactionary circles in those countries did not for a moment abandon their main class aim, that of destroying or at least weakening the Soviet Union

Victories or defeats have an enormous effect on belligerent and also on neutral states For example, during the Second World War Turkey officially followed a policy of

neutrality In connection with the successes of the German troops in the summer of 1942, however, the Turkish Government became increasingly inclined to enter the war on Germany s side But the rout of the nazi troops on the Volga and in the North Caucasus marked a turning point in the course of the war and induced the Turkish Government to reject the thought of a war against the USSR in alliance with nazi Germany Moreover, in February 1945 it even declared war on Germany, although at so late a date this was no more than a mere formality

Not only international relations, but also the internal political life of belligerents is greatly affected by the course of the war

The experience of the Second World War has shown that national liberation forces inevitably rise and organise in countries seized by aggressors The victories of the Soviet Army in this war held out great hope to the peoples enslaved by the German invaders and made them rise against their oppressors

This tendency clearly asserts itself also today The peoples of Indochina have risen in a body against the US aggressors The Israeli aggression has sparked off an upsurge in the activity of the Arab peoples, and the democratic forces have united not only in defence of their territory but, notably, in defence of their progressive transformations

When the war begins, the bourgeoisie is generally able to deprive the working class of some, often of many, of the positions it has won In war time conditions the ruling class applies open terror to suppress the most energetic and conscious portion of the proletariat and to inflict heavy blows to its revolutionary organisations At the same time it uses demagogy and false propaganda to poison the minds of part of the working class with chauvinistic ideas In this way the bourgeoisie succeeds in pushing the revolutionary working class movement temporarily to the background The bourgeois state often unleashes war because it expects by "an easy and rapid victory over the external enemy" to overcome the revolutionary forces within the country

While war deepens the contradictions of an exploiter state, it can also sharply intensify the class struggle and accelerate the victory of the working class War is a major crisis, and any crisis even if it makes possible a temporary

delay and regress ultimately means accelerated develop ment, the disclosure and intensification of contradictions, the collapse of everything rotten

War calls for an enormous exertion of all material and spiritual forces at the front and in the rear Marx wrote, 'Such is the redeeming feature of war, it puts a nation to the test As exposure to the atmosphere reduces all mummies to instant dissolution, so war passes supreme judgement upon social organisations that have outlived their vitality"[1] It subjects to a stern test the firmness and viability of polit ical systems Systems that had seemed all powerful and unshakeable often turned out to be rotten through and through This happened, for example, with the Russian autocracy during the First World War, and with the regimes in Germany and Italy during the Second World War

Such, historical experience shows, was the feedback effect of war on politics in the two great wars It is also con firmed by the wars in the contemporary epoch

2 POLITICS AND THERMONUCLEAR WAR

The interrelation between politics and war is not immu table As all the connections and relations in nature and society this interrelation, too, changes, develops, grows more complicated and acquires new forms An analysis and ac count of these changes is of enormous theoretical and prac tical importance because of the threat of a world thermonuc lear war, and also in connection with the numerous limited, local wars the imperialist aggressors are unleashing in different parts of the world

The Constant and the Changeable in the Interrelation Between Politics and War

As we said above, as regards their es sence, all past and present wars were a continuation of the policies of defi nite classes or states by means of armed force Two interrelated aspects should be discerned in that proposition

First the interrelation between politics, the political con tent, and armed force is a stable one This law all wars have in common, it comprises their basis, their backbone To use

[1] *New York Herald Tribune*, No 4 September 24 1855

Lenin's words, it "holds firm" and is "deep seated" There fore no matter what war we take, even a possible thermo nuclear one, as regards essence, they all were and will be a continuation of politics by means of armed force

Secondly, the interrelation between politics and war is changeable, because both elements involved in this relation are subject to change That is why the essence of war is not immutable Lenin emphasised that "the recognition of im mutable elements, 'of the immutable essence of things', and so forth, is not materialism, but *metaphysical*, i e, anti dialectical, materialism" [1] According to him not only phenomena are transient, mobile, in state of flux, and only conditionally divided, but also the essential nature of things

Hence, the immutability of the Marxist Leninist proposi tion on war as a continuation of politics by violent means does not mean that the essence of war, as expressed in the proposition, remains immutable For various reasons certain changes take place within the essence of war itself, within the correlation between its political content and armed force

That the interrelation between politics and war is both constant and changeable is due to the fact that in the course of socio economic development, the advanced, progressive classes replace the reactionary ones, the class structure of society and the relations between classes, nations and states change As a result, politics undergoes substantial changes, acquires a qualitatively different class content in different social formations In their turn the radical changes in poli cies tell on the essence, content and character of the war Such changes make it possible to distinguish between the wars in one epoch and those in another, provide a basis for a scientific classification of wars, for a definition of the atti tude towards them by the people, for working out the strat egy and tactics of the Marxist Leninist Parties

In his remarks on Clausewitz's book *On War* Lenin wrote out, underlined and marked "correct!" a proposition important to an understanding of the influence politics exerts on changes in the essence of war " war itself in its essence, in its forms has also undergone considerable changes these changes emerged not because the French Government

[1] V I Lenin *Collected Works* Vol 14 p 261

emancipated war, so to say, released it from the leash of politics these changes emerged from the new politics that emerged from the womb of the French revolution not only for France, but also for the whole of Europe "[1]

Particularly deep changes in the interrelation between politics and war were introduced by the October Socialist Revolution, which overthrew the exploiter system in Russia, put an end to the policy of social and national oppression which the exploiting classes were implementing, replaced it by a fundamentally different policy, by the qualitatively new political relations that emerged with the triumph of so cialism The revolutionary changes in politics had a major impact on the essence, content and character of the wars the Soviet state had to wage in self defence These wars were a continuation of the political struggle which the working people were waging for liberation from the capitalists in their own country and throughout the world

Simultaneously with the changes in politics, and under the impact of the latter as a result of the development of the productive forces and the advance of scientific and tech nological progress the means, methods and forms of the armed struggle improved and wars assumed a wider scale, they came to embrace greater territories, armies began to use more complex military equipment and weapons, more people were drawn into war, wars became more destructive, more far reaching social consequences ensued, and the feed back effect of war on politics and on all aspects of the life in the warring countries and their peoples was considerably intensified This too is a manifestation of the changes in the essence of war, in its content and character

The fundamental social changes in the world today the transformation of the world socialist system into the decisive factor in human development, the loss of this role by impe rialism, the greater aggressiveness of the latter, the giant scale assumed by political relations, which now embrace the struggle not only of classes, nations, and states, but also of military political blocs, of opposing world systems, the drawing into politics of millions of people in every corner of the globe, the rapid development of the productive forces, of the scientific and technological revolution, which has

[1] *Lenin Miscellany XII* p 441 (Russ ed)

provided politics with a powerful material and technical basis, and the enormous revolution in military affairs in the most advanced industrial states all this has complicated the interrelation between politics and war, and introduced new elements into it

The deep changes in politics and in the means used to conduct war will of necessity have a telling effect on the essence of the possible thermonuclear war the imperialists are preparing against the USSR and other socialist countries

Distortion of the Essence of Thermonuclear War by Bourgeois Philosophy and Sociology

Bourgeois sociological and philosophical thought is unable to resolve so complex a problem as the essence of the nuclear war It distorts the essence of nuclear missile war in many ways and consequently distorts also its content and character These distortions take many forms One of them is the distortion of the essence of politics, the isolation of politics from economics, from the activity of the masses, of classes, the removal from it of its objective content, the reduction of politics only to the subjective schemes of individuals

The reactionary US senator Barry Goldwater, for example, wrote 'The principles on which the Conservative political position is based have been established by a process that has nothing to do with the social, economic and political landscape that changes from decade to decade and from century to century These principles are derived from the nature of man, and from the truths that God has revealed about His creation"[1] R Aron, a French sociologist, in his book *Peace and War A Theory of International Relations* defined politics as "the total consideration of all circumstances by statesmen"[2] An idealistic interpretation of politics, intermingled with elements of religious mysticism and vulgar materialism is characteristic also of other bourgeois ideologists

At the same time the bourgeois ideologists artificially set up domestic policy in opposition to foreign policy and maintain that foreign policy decides domestic policy and thus

[1] Barry Goldwater *The Conscience of a Conservative* New York 1961 p 5

[2] Raymond Aron *Peace and War A Theory of International Relations*, New York 1966 p 23

attempt to prove that war is the product and continuation only of the former

The imperialists and their ideologists attempt to pass off the class essence of their politics and their anti popular aims as a supraclass' and 'supranational' policy, which they claim to conduct in "defence of a united Europe and of the entire Atlantic community" They say that in the nuclear age politics on a class and a national scale has exhausted itself has begun to hamper the development of the Western world In this connection they propose to throw overboard class and national institutions and state sovereignty, and to replace them by a 'supranational structure', to carry through a total integration", that is, a political, economic and mili tary union of the imperialist states for a "crusade' against the forces of peace, democracy, socialism and communism

The bourgeois ideologists falsify the essence of politics and assign it an absolute role According to some bourgeois ide ologists mankind has entered a new political age, in which, as the NATO journal *General Military Review* wrote, poli tics has become superpowerful [1] Therefore, the journal says, in addition to the 'nuclear missile wall", a "political wall" has to be raised against the socialist countries, and a con stant violent 'political war" has to be waged against them in order to change the relation of forces in the world in favour of the Western countries, to disunite the socialist countries, to weaken and destroy them These designs are built on shifting sands and are inevitably doomed to failure

This assigning of absolute, unlimited possibilities to politics leads to a false understanding of the interrelation between politics and war, to a disregard of the qualitative difference between them, makes for an identification of politics and war Small wonder, therefore, that the formula politics is a continuation of war by other means" is being disseminated in the capitalist countries, a formula that puts the cart before the horse in the relations between politics and war

The essence of nuclear missile war is also distorted by assigning absolute importance to armed violence This method is not novel The reduction of war to armed strug

[1] *General Military Review* No 10 Paris 1960

gle alone, the thesis that during military actions war is completely independent of politics was used in the past by extreme aggressive forces in attempts to substantiate the theory of the "supremacy" of the military leadership over the political leadership, to prove the need for the concentration of the entire state power in the hands of a military leader, that is, to prove the necessity for the setting up of a military dictatorship even before the outbreak of war

This fetishism of armed violence and its isolation from politics has assumed a new "nuclear" form in contemporary conditions Some bourgeois ideologists maintain that nuclear missile weapons, like the sorcerer s apprentice's broomstick, have freed themselves of the control of politics, have made war a technological combat on a global scale, a physical force of destruction free of any class political content

The West German sociologist G Siebers wrote that the "demon of technology" had upset all traditional concepts of a politically planned war, had disrupted its interrelation with politics and technology "The interaction between politics and strategy, on the one hand, and between politics and technology, on the other, have been eliminated by atomic power," he says [1] This leads to the conclusion that the connection between nuclear missile war and politics has been disrupted

Thus, in the matter of the interrelation between politics and nuclear war bourgeois sociologists and military theoreticians, on the one hand, exaggerate the importance of politics, identify it with war and, on the other, make a fetish of armed force and its means, reducing war to armed struggle alone Both these extremes prevent a correct understanding of politics and war, and of the essence of the latter

The above is confirmed in the article "On Understanding War" published in the journal *United States Naval Institute Proceedings* It says that in considering the interrelation between politics and war, one group of modern authors, consisting mainly of "hawks", extols armed violence, that all the research conducted by them deals solely with military strategy in the narrowest sense The other group is made up of the pacifists, the "doves", who overestimate the role of

[1] Georg Siebers *Das Ende des technischen Zeitalters*, Munchen, 1963 S 238

politics and belittle that of the element of violence in war, in fact, fully reject it "In their failure to understand war," the journal stresses, "the Hawks and the Doves are equally at fault They favor (or oppose) war either war in general or some particular war on doctrinaire grounds without really understanding what it is, why it occurred, or what role it is playing"[1] The journal notes that neither group really understands war This failure to understand war and the erroneous definitions of the essence of war are a product of the idealistic world outlook, a result of methodological helplessness, of the contradictory class positions held by imperialist theoreticians

Bourgeois ideologists intensify their attacks against the Marxist Leninist definition of war as a continuation of politics by violent means These attacks take mainly one of two forms One part of the bourgeois ideologists eulogises Clausewitz as "a great classicist" whose theories are applicable to all times, extols his merits in every way, calls his book *On War* an unsurpassed military theoretical "bible" and thereby distorts historical truth

The West German philosopher W R Schramm, for example, said "We too must develop Clausewitz's theory into an instrument of world political and philosophical controversy This is essential if we are to cross our spiritual swords with the East and vanquish it ideologically"[2] Bourgeois ideologists aver that there is nothing new in the Marxist Leninist teaching on war and that it has been fully and wholly drawn from Clausewitz, a representative of bourgeois military theoretical thought

In extolling Clausewitz and ignoring historical experience, the ideologists of the reactionary bourgeoisie, especially those closely connected with the top brass of the aggressive NATO bloc, make it appear that no changes have taken place in the interrelation between politics and war They justify the policy of nuclear blackmail, insist on keeping thermonuclear war in their political arsenal, advocate the thermonuclear and conventional arms race, and close their eyes to the danger of a new world war

[1] *United States Naval Institute Proceedings* July 1968 p 27
[2] *Wehr Wissenschaftliche Rundschau*, Heft 11, November 1958 S 655

H Kahn, an ideologist of US imperialism, who has been named the "Clausewitz of the nuclear age", develops in his books the idea of the "admissibility" of thermonuclear war as a political instrument He says that "war is a terrible thing, but so is peace"[1], believes that after a third world war with its use of weapons of mass destruction, with its colossal destruction and enormous toll of victims there will be " normal and happy lives for the majority of survivors and their descendants "[2]

H Kahn demands that thorough preparations be made for the world nuclear war, that atomic shelters be built, that industry be hidden underground in order to ensure the "nuclear survival" of the USA H Kahn's morbid misanthropic books, he himself admits, have become manuals for Pentagon's military planning

The ideologists of US imperialism are particularly fond of applying Clausewitz's erroneous propositions for their selfish ends, notably his view on the unlimited use of armed violence in an "absolute war" General Dale O Smith, for example, frankly said "The roots of the policy of a massive retaliation go back a long way The Clausewitz conception of war emphasised massive attack, instantly, at the critical point of enemy strength "[3]

The US Professor H Speier, an expert on international affairs, deliberately adapts his aggressive doctrine to some of Clausewitz's propositions He writes that total war, which had in the past formed the foundation of the nazi doctrine and is now being made much of by the American doctrine, is essentially unlimited war or, to use Clausewitz's expression, "absolute war" [4]

Other bourgeois ideologists, realising that a thermonuclear war will be fatal to capitalism, have fallen into the other extreme, and declare that the former view on the interrelation between politics and war is outdated and has lost all significance These ideologists endeavour to prove that nu

[1] Herman Kahn *On Thermonuclear War* Princeton New Jersey 1960 p 46

[2] *Ibid* p 16

[3] Dale O Smith *US Military Doctrine A Study and Appraisal* New York 1955 p 46

[4] *Krieg und Frieden in industriellen Zeitalter* C Berteilsmann Verlag Gutersloch 1966 S 277

clear missile weapons have consigned the formula that war is a continuation of politics by violent means to history

US Senator James William Fulbright said in one of his speeches that " there is no longer any validity in the Clausewitz doctrine of war as a carrying out of policy with other means Nuclear weapons have rendered it totally obsolete "[1] Such views are propounded also in *The Nuclear Strategy* by Claude Delmas, a French sociologist and historian, who says that in the nuclear age Clausewitz's definition of war is outdated[2] Such statements abound also in the works by many other Western sociologists and writers on military matters, including in those by Edger J Kingston McCloughry, Ferdinand O Miksche, Stephen King Hall, Fritz Sternberg and others

The main argument against the definition of war as a continuation of politics by violent means builds on the fact that nuclear war actually abolishes the distinction between front and rear and threatens both belligerents with catastrophic consequences Undeniably, these arguments of Western sociologists and writers on military matters, holding different philosophical views and standing on different political positions, contain 'an iota of truth' This shows that they are aware of the enormous danger constituted by nuclear war as an instrument of aggressive imperialist policies Yet, despite all that their arguments are one sided and untenable

This is because, firstly, in criticising Clausewitz's theory and the formula that war is a continuation of politics by violent means the bourgeois writers offer no solution for the problem of the interrelations between politics and war themselves, do not help to clear up the problem, but only confuse it

Secondly bourgeois sociologists and writers on military subjects use the pretext that the formula of war being a continuation of politics by violent means is outdated as a basis for their attempts to discredit the most important component of the Marxist Leninist teaching on war and politics, and aver that it is inapplicable in the nuclear age This is

[1] *United States of America Congressional Record Proceedings and Debates of the 88th Congress First Session* August 21, 1963 to September 12 1963 p 16538

[2] Claude Delmas *La Strategie Nucleaire*, Paris, 1963 p 18

the latest variant in the many attempts to refute the Marxist Leninist view on politics and war, on the interrelation between the two, a variant which they, for reasons of camouflage, sometimes try to pass off as love of peace

Thirdly Western sociologists and authors on military subjects confuse two closely interconnected yet different questions, namely, the theoretical question of the essence (content and character) of nuclear war and the practical question of whether it can serve as an effective instrument of policy making

Fourthly, their arguments are erroneous and one sided because they attempt to gloss over the role aggressive imperialist policies play in the creation and development of new weapons Nuclear missile weapons are not simply the result of scientific and technological progress in the USA They are the embodiment in "hardware' of the aggressive anti socialist policies of US imperialism

Fifthly the main fault of these arguments is that they mask the predatory nature of US imperialism, belittle the danger of its aggressive policies, and its ability to unleash a new world war The proponents of these arguments forget the fate of Hiroshima and Nagasaki A monster created by imperialist policies, nuclear missile weapons have in their turn begun to exert an enormous influence on the policies of the US ruling circles, have made them even more reactionary and adventuristic

The attacks bourgeois ideologists mount with increasing frequency against the proposition that war is a continuation of politics by violent means do not pursue the aim of gaining a deeper understanding of the truth, but intend to distort this complicated question By their arguments the bourgeois theoreticians, consciously or unconsciously, attempt to divorce the nuclear missile war under preparation from the aggressive policies of imperialism They deceive the people as to the essence, political content and class character of a probable war (and its causes), want to disarm them morally and politically, to keep them from using correct tactics, from adopting a correct orientation and line of action, suggest the idea that in case of a world war the population and the armed forces of the NATO countries will fight not for the political interests and aspirations of monopoly capital, but to save their lives, and to escape physical destruction

Marxist Leninist methodology makes it possible to solve the question of the interrelation between politics and armed force in the possible nuclear war in a consistently scientific way As regards its essence, such a war would also be a continuation of the politics of classes and states by violent means Politics will determine when the armed struggle is to be started and what means are to be employed Nuclear war cannot emerge from nowhere, out of a vacuum, by itself, without the deliberately malicious politics of imperialism's most aggressive circles As the First and Second World Wars, which were products of the aggressive, predatory policies of the imperialist states, as also the numerous limited, local wars, unleashed by the imperialists after 1945, a nuclear missile war, if it is allowed to come to a head, will also be a product of the aggressive policies of US imperialism and its partners in various blocs

On the Essence of the Possible Nuclear Missile War

The social, class content of nuclear missile war and its aims will be determined by politics The new world war will be, on one side, the continuation, weapon and instrument of criminal imperialist policies being implemented with nuclear missiles On the other side, it will be the lawful and just counteraction to aggression, the natural right and sacred duty of progressive mankind to destroy imperialism, its bitterest enemy, the source of destructive wars

Hence, the nuclear missile war will also be a continuation of politics, although some ideologists of imperialism deny this, in fact, it will be even more 'political" In his remarks to Clausewitz s book *On War* Lenin stressed the idea that "war seems the more 'warlike', the more political it is "[1] This emphasises the growth in scope and depth of the influence politics exercises on war, expresses a certain regularity the "politisation" of war in step with its industrialisation and mechanisation (Armed struggle with the use of nuclear missiles and other weapons will ultimately be subordinated to the interests of a definite policy, will become a means of attaining definite political aims

However, the fact that nuclear war, should the imperialists unleash it, will be a product and continuation of their mad policy by means of armed force, does not mean that there will be no changes in the essence of war On the con

[1] *Lenin Miscellany XII* p 397 (Russ ed)

trary, the changes will be more important and significant than those of the past

The deep qualitative changes in modern politics, on the one hand, and the revolution in the means and methods of the armed struggle, on the other, of necessity affect the essence of the possible nuclear missile war and make it different from the essence of past and present wars waged with conventional weapons

The differences in the essence of the possible world nuclear missile war will be determined [first] by its concrete political content and by the depth, volume and scale of the political aims It will resolve not specific limited political interests, but a crucial historical problem, one affecting the fate of all mankind Never before has such a colossal problem formed the political content of war This is one of the radical differences between the essence of nuclear missile war and that of all past and present wars

The difference in the essence of nuclear war will depend, secondly on the qualitatively new ways of achieving political aims Whereas in conventional wars political aims are realised mainly by destroying the enemy's armed forces and by imposing on him the victor's will, in nuclear war it will be attained by crushing the enemy's armed forces and nuclear power, as well as his economic, scientific and moral political potential

The essence of the new world war will probably differ, thirdly in specific military and technical respects, that is, qualitatively new methods, means and forms of armed struggle will be used as compared with those applied in the past The war will draw many countries and peoples into its orbit, will become a coalitional world war

The difference in the essence of nuclear missile war will be due, fourthly to its possible consequences The documents of the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties say "Today, when nuclear bombs can reach any continent within minutes and lay waste vast territories, a world conflict would spell the death of hundreds of millions of people, and the destruction and incineration of the treasures of world civilisation and culture' [1] Such a war, if it is not averted, will be disastrous for the imperialists

[1] *International Meeting of Communist and Workers Parties Moscow 1969*, Prague 1969 p 47

In the new war, if it should be allowed to happen, victory will be with the countries of the world socialist system which are defending progressive, ascending tendencies in social development, have at their command all the latest kinds of weapons, and enjoy the support of the working people of all countries The balance of forces between the two systems, the logic of history, its objective laws, prescribing that the new in social development is invincible all this predicts such an outcome The might of the Soviet state, of the entire socialist community, which possesses the economic, moral political and military technical preconditions for utterly routing any aggressor, substantiates this view Other factors and forces which will inevitably spring into action as soon as war breaks out must also not be thrown off the scales, they will include decisive anti imperialist actions by the people, political, diplomatic, international legal, ideological and other actions against those responsible for unleashing a nuclear adventure

In their analysis of the possible changes in historical development and the consequent difference between the essence of nuclear missile war and that of conventional wars, of the interrelations between such a war and politics, Marxists Leninists do not confuse this issue with other issues that are closely connected but not identical with it, such as whether or not thermonuclear war is admissible as a political means, whether or not it is rational to use weapons of mass destruction, and whether or not it is possible to preserve peace Marxists Leninists decisively condemn nuclear war, consider it the heaviest crime that could be committed against humanity, and stand for the complete ban and destruction of all weapons of mass annihilation, for the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe and for the preservation of world peace

The above shows that the accusation that Soviet Marxists have abandoned Lenin s proposition on war as a continuation of politics by violent means, brought by the 'Left revolutionaries, is slander of the vilest kind They repeat this proposition dogmatically and ignore the specifics of nuclear weapons and the dangerous consequences their use will entail The sectarians attempt to use the proposition on the interrelation between politics and war as proof of the inevitability, and even of the desirability, of nuclear war as a

means of politics, as a means of accelerating the world rev olutionary process Such views play into the hand of the im perialist aggressors

The possibility of changes in the essence of war, in its interrelation with politics has also influenced the position of some imperialist theoreticians and statesmen Their posi tion with respect to nuclear missile war is a dual and contra dictory one On the one hand, they regard nuclear missile war as a means of struggle against socialism and commu nism, but, on the other, fear the ruinous consequences a ther monuclear war would have for capitalism Morton H Hal perin, an American writer on military problems, for exam ple, says that the ' central paradox of the Nuclear Age ' is that, ' total ideological conflict plus total means of destruc tion have produced a situation in which a total solution is impossible [1] But, the most aggressive imperialist statesmen and ideologists, who are closely connected with the aggres sive imperialist blocs, close their eyes to the thermonuclear peril and insist on an unlimited arms race, on the unleashing of military conflicts, of small and big wars, which are fraught with the danger of a nuclear missile war

Thus, a Marxist Leninist analysis of the interrelation be tween politics and nuclear war provides a deep understand ing of the essence of the possible new world war, helps to reveal what it has in common with the wars of the past and present, and to determine the specific features distinguish ing it from all other wars

3 THE ECONOMIC FOUNDATION OF WARS

While engendering wars and determining their aims politics is neither primary nor self contained It is deter mined by the vital interests of different classes evolved by the socio economic system of the exploiter state This sys tem, which has given rise to wars, is characterised by the domination of private ownership, the concentration of the bulk of the means of production in the hands of the exploiter classes, who exist by appropriating the surplus product

[1] Morton H Halperin *Contemporary Military Strategy* Boston 1967 p 12

created by the working people This is what all class antagonistic formations have in common, what forms the common source of wars of the most varied type

All wars in the past and present, those between exploiter states in pursuit of the selfish interests of slave owners, feudal lords and the bourgeoisie, as also the uprisings and wars of the working people against their enslavers, against whom they rose when their position had become unbearable and their patience had worn out, all these wars were caused by private ownership relations and the resultant social and class antagonisms in exploiter formations However, this does not mean that the specific differences in the causes of wars have been abolished Wars in each of the above formations and in definite historical epochs had their own, specific causes

The Economic Roots of Wars Under Capitalism

Capitalism ushered in a new epoch in the history of wars The basic law of capitalism is the production of surplus value The aim of capitalist production is the constant, unlimited accumulation of profit Capitalists cannot rest content with the mass of the surplus value being created by the proletariat of their own country Their appetites are insatiable They scour the world in search of high profits Wars are a means of rapid enrichment for the capitalists and, hence, a constant travelling companion of capitalism The system of the exploitation of man by man and the system of the destruction of man by man are two sides of the capitalist order War is a means by which the bourgeoisie obtains new raw material sources and markets, robs foreign countries and makes easy profits

Capitalism created a world market for the first time in history and enlarged the number of objects over which wars were waged Chief among them were colonies sources of cheap raw materials and labour power, spheres for the export of goods and capital, strongholds on international trade routes For several centuries bourgeois Holland, Britain, France, Portugal and other European states waged wars of conquest against the weakly developed countries in order to make colonies of them There were also wars between the capitalist countries themselves for a division of the world

Naturally, some wars under capitalism were due also to

other causes The development of the productive forces of c ıpıtalism was obstructed ın many countrıes by natıonal oppressıon and polıtıcal decentralısatıon The epoch from the French bourgeoıs revolutıon of 1789 1794 to the Parıs Commune of 1871 saw bourgeoıs progressıve, natıonal lıber atıon wars among other types of war The maın content and hıstorıcal purpose of these wars was to overthrow absolutısm and to destroy foreıgn oppressıon

Wıth the transıtıon of capıtalısm to the ımperıalıst stage, the bourgeoıs states became much more aggressıve Thıs ıs explaıned by the economıc features of ımperıalısm, whıch ıs a decaymg and morıbund capıtalısm

At the turn of the century leap lıke development replaced the more or less regular spread of capıtalısm over the globe Thıs led to an unprecedented growth and ıntensıfıcatıon of all the contradıctıons of that system economıc, polıtıcal, class and natıonal The struggle of the ımperıalıst powers for markets and spheres of capıtal ınvestment, for raw materıals and labour power, and for world domınatıon took on ex tremely sharp forms Whıle ımperıalısm ruled undıvıdedly thıs struggle ınevıtably led to destructıve wars

The basıc economıc sources of these wars were rooted ın the deepenıng conflıct between the modern productıve forces and the economıc, and also polıtıcal system of ımperıalısm Thıs was the maın cause of the armed clashes between ım perıalıst powers

The confines of old natıonal states, wıthout the formatıon of whıch capıtalısm could not have overthrown feudalısm, became too narrow for ıt The productıve forces of world capıtalısm outgrew the lımıted framework of bourgeoıs states The whole world merged ınto a sıngle economıc organısm, and was at the same tıme dıvıded up among a handful of bıg ımperıalıst powers Thıs contradıctıon found expressıon ın the strıvıng of the bourgeoısıe to export capıtal and to wın markets for commodıtıes they cannot sell at home, to seıze raw materıal sources and new colonıes, to destroy competıtors on world markets and to conquer world domınatıon and, hence, to unleash wars

The conflıct between the productıve forces (wıth the na tıonal ımperıalıst lımıts ımposed on theır development) and the capıtalıst relatıons of productıon ıs strıkıngly expressed ın the uneven, leap lıke economıc and polıtıcal development

of capitalist countries under imperialism Thus, at the beginning of the century bourgeois countries which had launched out on industrial development only recently found themselves in a favourable situation and succeeded, by a sudden forward dash, to outstrip the old industrial capitalist states in a comparatively short time After the Second World War the share and role of the individual capitalist states changed again and the unevenness of their economic development intensified

Uneven development inevitably leads to abrupt changes in the alignment of forces in the world capitalist system From time to time a sharp disturbance of the equilibrium occurs within that system The old distribution of spheres of influence among the monopolies clashes with the new alignment of forces in the world To bring the distribution of colonies in accord with the new balance of forces, there inevitably have to be periodical redivisions of the already divided world Under capitalism armed violence is the only way of dividing up colonies and spheres of influence

"Capitalism," Lenin said, "has concentrated the earth's wealth in the hands of a few states and divided the world up to the last bit Any further enrichment could take place only at the expense of others, as the enrichment of one state at the expense of another The issue could only be settled by force and, accordingly, war between the world marauders became inevitable"[1] *As a result of the social antagonisms inherent in capitalism and the operation of the law of the uneven, leap like economic and political development of the capitalist countries under imperialism, the contradictions between the bourgeois states aggravate to the utmost, and this leads to a division of the capitalist world into hostile coalitions, and to wars between them*

The First and the Second World Wars burst forth on this economic basis The imperialists of all countries, the entire world system of capitalism were guilty of them These wars had catastrophical results for the international bourgeoisie, promoted the formation of the world socialist community and the collapse of the colonial system of imperialism However, the ruling circles of the imperialist states did not draw the necessary conclusions from them

[1] V I Lenin, *Collected Works* Vol 28 p 80

Formerly the aggravation of the contradictions between these states or their coalitions was the main reason respon sible for the striving of imperialist states to unleash wars These contra dictions continue to aggravate However, the main contradiction now is that between the two opposing social systems capitalism and socialism

Reasons for the Greater Aggressiveness of the Imperialist States Today

The contradictions between the two world systems are class contradictions The socialist system greatly diminishes the sphere of imperialist exploitation and domination, creat ing conditions in which capitalism will lose the privileges it still enjoys Socialism has a revolutionising influence on the working people in the capitalist countries, the colonies and dependent countries

Another reason for the growing aggressiveness of modern imperialism is that the contradictions between the imperial ist states, on the one hand, and the colonies and recent col onies, on the other, have greatly aggravated Under the influence of the example set by the Soviet Union once a backward agrarian country and now a mighty industrial power and that of the successes achieved by other socialist countries, the popular masses in Asia, Africa and Latin America have launched a national liberation revolution Deep antagonisms divide the imperialist states and the countries that have won national independence or are still fighting for liberation

The imperialist predators are willing to resort to any means, fair or foul, to preserve and strengthen their colonial possessions They attempt to suppress the national liberation struggle of the African peoples by force of arms, they un leash wars in the Southeast Asian countries and organise reactionary coups in the Latin American states Colonialism and neocolonialism are the direct and indirect cause of many conflicts threatening to plunge mankind into a new war

The third cause is the exacerbation of the internal con tradictions of capitalism after the Second World War This is linked, first and foremost, with the continuing aggravation and deepening of the general crisis of capitalism, with the fact that the main contradiction of capitalist society, that between labour and capital, continues to grow The transi tion from monopoly capitalism to state monopoly capitalism,

under which the monopolies merge with the state, intensifies the exploitation of the working people, makes science and technology and the growing productive forces serve the aim of enriching a handful of monopolists Exploitation has never been as hideous as it is today Even when business conditions are favourable millions of people, workers and intellectuals are unemployed, and peasants are ruined and evicted from their land At the same time a small number of powerful monoplies is profiting from the exploitation of the working people, from the arms race and aggressive wars

State monopoly capitalism is responsible for the unprecedented intensification of militarism, including the economic and ideological fields Militarisation permeates the entire life of bourgeois society The production of mass destruction weapons eats up an enormous part of the national income of the bourgeois states During the past 20 years US military spending has increased more than 48 fold over that in the two prewar decades More than 75 per cent of the total expenditure in the US Federal Budget is directly or indirectly channeled to military needs The growth in weapons production in the main imperialist states makes other countries spend large funds on strengthening their defence too

The imperialist state is becoming a militaristic police state The economic superstructure rising on the basis of finance capital, and the politics and ideology of the finance oligarchy strengthen the state's aggressiveness Under state monopoly capitalism "big business", the political leaders and the top brass controlling the state, make it pursue a policy aimed at preparing a war against the Soviet Union and other socialist states

The sharp diminution of the sphere of action of the imperialist forces and the extreme aggravation of the contradictions under state monopoly capitalism make the economic and political development of the bourgeois countries ever more uneven This is the fourth reason responsible for the greater aggressiveness of the imperialist states

In recent years serious changes have taken place in the relation of forces within the capitalist world This process is continuing

Intense exploitation of the working people through the system of state monopoly capitalism, relatively small military spending over a long period of time, the high level of capital investments and the comparatively rapid growth of labour productivity, the application of the fruits of scientific and technological progress, and the considerable material assistance given to them by the USA and some other countries have led to rapid economic advance in West Germany and Japan For several years the West European countries and Japan outstripped the USA in economic growth rates Lately, however, their roles have changed again

This deepened the contradictions between the USA and the European capitalist countries and Japan The competitive struggle in Western Europe has also taken on sharper forms, including the Common Market and other state monopoly associations New forms of international economic associations and new ways of dividing markets have emerged, as have also new centres of attraction and new hotbeds of contradictions All this must be taken into account when the economic reasons for military clashes are investigated

The triumph of socialist revolutions and the transition of a growing number of countries to the socialist road have greatly weakened imperialism But, imperialism does not want to give up its positions without struggle The class social antagonisms between the two social systems are growing ever more distinct and at times assume very sharp forms

The contradiction between capitalism and socialism is stronger than the inter imperialist contradictions It reflects all the contradictions of the epoch and leaves a deep mark on all major international events It should be remembered that the growth of the forces of socialism and the upsurge of the class and national liberation struggle are attended by the growing aggressiveness of the monopoly bourgeoisie, which fights social progress by all and every means and attempts to preserve its class privileges and riches at all costs

The advance of the world socialist system and other factors do much to exacerbate inter imperialist contradictions They exert a dual influence On the one hand, they strengthen the will of the imperialist powers to unite, to create military, political and other alliances, on the other,

they deepen the contradictions between them This corrobo rates Lenin's statement that " two trends exist, one, which makes the alliance of all the imperialists inevitable, the other, which places the imperialists in opposition to each other two trends, neither of which has any firm founda tions" [1]

After the Second World War the first tendency naturally grew stronger in the course of the struggle waged by the imperialist powers against the socialist system Imperialist states energetically strengthened their aggressive military blocs, signed bilateral pacts, etc For the first time in history the main imperialist powers, the USA, Britain, West Ger many and others joined a single military alliance directed against the socialist system

Naturally, the fact that there are two opposite tendencies in the development of the imperialist system makes every alliance of the capitalist countries contradictory and unsta ble Such alliances (organisations) directed against the so cialist countries and the national liberation movement do not resolve the economic and political contradictions between the individual capitalist countries in those alliances and within every one of them but, on the contrary, further deepen and aggravate them Besides, the setting up of organisations in volving a number of capitalist countries inevitably leads to a growth of the contradictions within these organisations and struggle against outsiders At present, however, these inter imperialist contradictions are dampened by the even sharper class antagonisms That is why a war between the big im perialist states, though still possible, is far less likely now than it was before

Thus, the world imperialist system is torn by deep and sharp antagonisms These are contradictions between labour and capital and between the people and the monopolies, growing militarisation, the disintegration of the colonial sys tem, the antagonisms between the young national states and the old colonial powers, and most important the rapid growth of world socialism that undermines and erodes im perialism, weakens it and spells its doom

In view of the above the imperialists intend to save capit

[1] V I Lenin *Collected Works*, Vol 27 p 369

alism through war, the danger of which is great at present and is threatening all the peoples of our planet *It is precisely because capitalism at its highest stage has entered the period of its decline and ruin and is going through a new, third stage of its general crisis, that its aggressive strivings are not decreasing but are incessantly growing*

Imperialist aggression is spearheaded against the socialist community and only the strength of the countries in that community, notably that of the Soviet Union, prevents international reaction from unleashing a world military conflict At the same time the antagonisms between the handful of highly developed imperialist powers and the young developing countries are growing sharper The imperialists attempt with all the means at their disposal to hamper the peoples from carrying out radical changes in their social systems With this aim in view they unleash local wars, instigate military coups and organise plots and interventions

Socio Economic Conditions for the Establishment of Peace

War, as Marxism Leninism has shown scientifically, is not a permanent feature in history The historical inevitability of transition of all or at least of the main countries to socialism creates the economic basis for banning wars from the life of society and for establishing eternal peace Mankind has already attained a stage of development in which there are material prerequisites determining not only the possibility but also the objective need for the victory of the new, socialist system, under which the causes breeding wars and military conflicts will disappear Lenin wrote

'our aim is to achieve a socialist system of society, which, by eliminating the division of mankind into classes, by eliminating all exploitation of man by man and nation by nation, will inevitably eliminate the very possibility of war'[1]

The modern productive forces have created the material prerequisites and the objective need for the transition of mankind to socialism Because of their high level of development and social character an extensive division of labour has been established between different countries, and close economic ties have been formed The development of sea,

[1] V I Lenin *Collected Works* Vol 24 pp 398 99

land and air transport has made it possible to cover the distances between countries in no time

Modern scientific and technological progress opens up broad prospects for the rapid development of the productive forces and for the radical improvement of the material conditions in all countries The introduction of its enormous achievements, on a mass scale, the extensive use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, and the comprehensive automation of production will give mankind unheard of wealth, which we must not risk losing just to please a handful of warmongers

However, the long since obsolete capitalist relations of production prevent the use of the enormous achievements made by production, science and technology in the interests of all members of society, and also equal economic co operation between the peoples

Under capitalism already there is a clearly expressed tendency towards the setting up of a single world economy managed according to a common plan, a tendency that will undoubtedly develop further and will fully assert itself once socialism is established on a global scale Socialism will remove the barriers between countries and nations imperialism has set up, will unite mankind into a single workers' collective The triumph of socialism in all countries will bring a social system "whose international rule will be *Peace*, because its national rules will be everywhere the same *Labour*!"[1]

These prophetic words which were spoken by Marx as early as 1870, have been fully borne out by the peace loving policy of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, by the new relations between them These are relations of fraternal co operation and mutual assistance between countries, in which the leading role is played by the working class, and in which the working people themselves are the masters of their destiny, and are building a new life without the bourgeoisie The socialist community embodies the objective invincibility of mankind's movement toward eternal peace

Now the world socialist system determines the main trend

[1] *The General Council of the First International 1870 1871 Minutes* Moscow 1967 p 328

of human society's historical progress The further transformation of the world socialist system into the decisive factor in mankind's social development will express not only the chief content, trend and main distinctive features of history, but also the entire process of that development, all its paths and specific features

But, until the economic basis of wars and their only source imperialism continue to exist, until imperialist policy and ideology are aimed at preparing and unleashing military conflicts, the economic and military might of the Soviet Union and the entire socialist community, the policy and ideology of the building and defence of socialism and communism, will have to play an important part in preventing wars and reining in the aggressive imperialist forces

4 WAR AND IDEOLOGY

When the question of war is being decided, enormous attention must be given not only to the economic conditions and a given alignment of the class and political forces, but also to ideological aspects, for ideology always expresses and defends the vital interests of classes, expresses their principal, essential aspirations Imperialist ideology anticommunism is the ideology of monopoly capital, whereas communist ideology Marxism Leninism expresses the vital interests of the working class and of all working people

Ideology fulfils the function of a specific instrument of war Ideological means of struggle are specific because, on the whole, they influence the course and results of military operations and the war not directly, but through the impact they make on the minds of the people, on their world outlook, views, morale and fighting efficiency Ideological means are able to strengthen the morale of the troops and of the population of one s own country, and to erode the morale and political principles of the army and the population of the enemy countries

It is particularly important to emphasise that ideology has an enormous impact on the war aims (hence, also on the character of the war) and on strategy, providing the basis for the policies of classes and states during the preparations for the war and the war itself Even though these functions

are relatively independent, they are organically combined and interact with each other, for ideology influences the war through the activity of people

Historical Place and Role of Ideology in Wars

The ideological struggle and ideology in general have played different roles in wars fought in different historical periods In the past their role was limited above all as regards their influence on the enemy In the 20th century, when the technical possibilities of influencing the masses have grown, when the masses have become more enlightened and are drawn ever deeper into politics, the role of the ideological struggle in war has greatly increased In just wars the spread of communist ideology plays an enormous role in ensuring the victories of the working masses over their enemies

In modern conditions the ideological struggle preceding war and attending it is particularly sharp, and defeat in war is not only a military, economic and political defeat, but also an ideological one Nowadays a war cannot be begun and conducted, let alone won, without a thorough ideological preparation of the people and the army

The role of ideology in war depends on the form it takes in a definite historical epoch, notably on the interests of what class it expresses, on the historical role of that class, and on the political aims it pursues in the given war This role is determined also by the laws and motive forces of social development

In the epoch of feudalism, for example, religious ideology was dominant All annexationist, predatory wars, and also the revolutionary wars the peasant masses waged against the feudal lords, were conducted under the banner of religious ideas But while the form religious ideology was similar, the political aspirations underlying this ideology differed

With the advent of capitalism and bourgeois national states, political ideology became decisive in the wars waged by these states and the bourgeoisie often counterposed political ideology to the religious ideology of the feudals and the clergy

Typical of the period of the progressive development of capitalism were wars aimed at resolving questions of bourgeois democratic transformations, at overthrowing foreign oppression and defending national freedom During that

epoch bourgeois ideology was mainly a national ideology, used as an instrument in the struggle for the setting up of bourgeois national states with a national culture of their own

This ideology had a progressive role to play It was the spiritual power that helped the bourgeoisie rally the popular masses round it The national ideology continues to play this relatively progressive role at definite stages of the national liberation struggle of the peoples in the colonial and depend ent countries against imperialist oppression

The national ideology created in the epoch of national wars made a deep imprint on the petty bourgeoisie and on a definite part of the proletariat It has been used by the bourgeoisie in the predatory wars of the imperialist period By using the "national" ideology and speculating on the "defence of motherland" concept, the imperialist bourgeoisie deceived the people in the First World War

After the Second World War the "national" ideology was no longer able to meet imperialist interests This is because that ideology does not unite, but disunites the imperialist states according to the national principle and hampers the establishment of unity within their aggressive military blocs Some bourgeois scientists are compelled to admit that the European peoples' nationalism has become so strong that it hinders the political, economic and military unity of Western Europe This compels imperialist theoreticians to change and remodel the old ideological weapon to make it serve the new aims They now advance to the foreground the ideology of "Europeanism" and "Atlanticism" and attack the national istic "narrow mindedness" of some European nations

Modern bourgeois reactionary ideology, first, strives in every way to patch up and refurbish the ragged ideals of the 'free world', secondly, gives a grotesquely distorted picture of the nature and of the regularities of historical dev elopment Bourgeois propaganda attempts to gloss over the main social antagonisms and the faults of the modern capit alist world, to blunt the political consciousness and to para lyse the working people's will to struggle for socialism

Anti communism is now the main ideologico political weapon of imperialism Its main content is slander about the socialist system, the falsified interpretation of the poli cies and aims of the Communist Parties, and of the Marxist Leninist teaching

Anti communism is a clear expression of the crisis of modern bourgeois ideology This crisis has been brought about by the inability of the imperialist bourgeoisie to advance ideas that could grip the minds of the masses It is a direct result of the triumphant march of Marxism Leninism The masses are increasingly adopting Marxist Leninist ideas and are guided by them in the anti imperialist struggle

Imperialist reaction uses the false slogans of anti communism to persecute everything progressive, advanced and revolutionary Anti communism is used to fight the national liberation movement and to split the ranks of the working people Anti communism in the USA, the Programme of the Communist Party of the United States says, "serves essentially the same purposes today as it served in Hitler s day" [1]

Even though there are many kinds and forms of bourgeois ideology, many methods and means for deceiving the working people, they all have a single aim to defend the obsolescent capitalist system Modern bourgeois political and economic theories, philosophy and sociology, ethics and aesthetics serve to justify monopoly rule and exploitation, to defame public property and collectivism, extol militarism and war, vindicate colonialism and racialism and to sow strife and hatred between peoples

Historical experience, notably the Great Patriotic War (1941 1945), has confirmed that ideology plays an immense role in war The Soviet Union, which represented a new social system socialism, a new military organisation the Soviet Army, and a new ideology communism, faced nazi Germany in a life and death struggle The two countries had nothing in common with each other

The experience of the Second World War, notably that of the Great Patriotic War (1941 1945), revealed one more reason for the increased role of ideology in modern war In the wars of the imperialist period and right up to the emergence of the socialist system, the opponents generally embraced a similar ideology First, it was an ideology of the exploiter classes, second, it was anti scientific and, third, it directly or eventually opposed the interests of mankind's progressive development

---

[1] *New Programme of the Communist Party of the USA (A Draft)* Political Affairs Publishers New York 1966 p 30

When similar ideologies clash in a war, their influence on its course is neutralised and is therefore difficult to discern Although in these cases ideology also plays a major role in the preparation and conduct of the war, it is not the nature of the ideology but the character of the political aims that makes for the ideological supremacy of one of the warring sides

It was only in the civil wars of the past that different ideologies opposed each other This was the case in the wars of slaves against slave owners, of the serfs against the land owners, and in the wars of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie As we said above, the participants in peasant wars formally adopted a religious ideology, but in political content it differed radically from the ideology of the feudal lords

Modern wars are generally clashes between opposing ideologies Two ideologies opposed each other in the war of the first socialist state against the foreign interventionists and the internal counter revolutionaries, in the war against nazi Germany, and in the wars of the peoples of Korea, Vietnam and Cuba against the imperialist aggressors In the wars of the colonial peoples for their independence, progressive national ideology opposes the reactionary ideology of imperialism

The Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union has shown the importance of ideological supremacy in war This supremacy will show even more clearly if the imperialist maniacs should unleash a new war against the socialist countries The growing influence of communist ideology on the minds and psychology of the masses and on their will to fight will be of paramount importance to the course and outcome of the war

The greater role played by ideology in modern wars is due also to the extension and perfection of the mass media (the press, cinema, radio, TV, etc) In the capitalist countries these media are in the hands of the bourgeoisie and serve to propagate its ideology However, there are also progressive forces in the capitalist countries, who use various means to fight the disintegrating influence of imperialist ideas, the ideology of militarism and aggression The socialist countries too possess all the propaganda media The power and effectiveness of communist ideology have been proved by the entire

course of historical development, by the more than half century long experience in the building of socialism and communism in the USSR, and by the victories of its armed forces in defending the new social system

Bourgeois Views on the Role of Ideology in Modern War

After the Second World War imperialist theoreticians became particularly voluble about the role of ideology They draw their generalisations and conclusions from the experience of that war in the interests of their class, in the interests of preparing and unleashing aggressive local wars and a third world war This can be seen in particular from the fact that most military ideologists of imperialism, generals, retired or still in active service, as well as many "civilian" philosophers and sociologists, all raise a hue and cry about the supposed advent of an epoch of ideological wars, and aver that ideological wars are a feature specific of the modern historical period

"We stand on the threshold of ideological wars," writes Werner Picht [1] 'We are entering an age when *ideological contradictions become primary forces for transforming the world,*"[2] he is echoed by Hasso von Manteufel Many other imperialist theoreticians speak and write in the same vein

The assertion that modern wars are ideological ones is particularly absurd because ideological contradictions have never been and never can be primary they have always been and always will be secondary, derivative of economic contradictions

This applies also to the epoch of religious wars, to which the bourgeois ideologists like to refer as examples of ideological wars In reality religious wars were an upshot of economic causes and pursued very definite political, class aims Religious views were not the cause of these wars, they were but ideological weapons

All talk of the modern bourgeois ideologists about the epoch of ideological wars is directed against the basic Marxist Leninist principle that war is the continuation of the policies of a class by violent means, and that politics itself is "a concentrated expression of the economy" The aim of

[1] *Bilanz des Zweiten Weltkrieges*, Oldenburg/Hamburg 1953, S 36
[2] *Ibid* S 456

this talk is to make it appear as though the presence of opposing ideologies in the two world systems is the source of a possible third world war, as though communist ideology contains the seeds of war

The former British Minister Michael Stuart believes that the Soviet Union's refusal to discontinue the ideological struggle prevents the establishment of good neighbourly relations between countries and peoples [1]

Speaking of ideological war, some military ideologists are compelled to admit that ideological defeat is the heaviest of all That is why they work hard to hammer out an ideology corresponding to the essential tasks of the imperialist bourgeoisie at present and in the future war, to enable it, as they say, 'to stand the onslaught of communist ideas" "In the age of ideological wars and in a struggle against a military power impregnated ideologically through and through success can be achieved only by an army that is itself deeply convinced of the values, ideas and moral principles it is to defend "[2]

This, in fact, is the reason for all the talk about our special age of ideological wars The champions of the nazi ideology dream of 'impregnating" the armies of the imperialist states with an ideology that could hold out against the communist ideology in the future war Aware of the bankruptcy of fascist ideology and the complete triumph of communist ideology in the Second World War, imperialist ideologists are unable to draw correct conclusions, because they are steeped in class prejudice

They picture the doom of capitalism in some European countries as the doom of civilisation in general, and dream of restoring capitalism in the socialist countries Depending on conditions, they don the ideology of cosmopolitanism, nationalism, racialism, Malthusianism, "people's capitalism", "national communism", or whatever else they think will serve their purpose at the moment

They expect the corrupt ideology of imperialism to act as a cohesive force that will enable them to wage predatory wars But their hopes are vain the neo ideology they are creating will inevitably collapse

[1] *Foreign Affairs* July 1970 p 648
[2] *Bilanz des Zweiten Weltkrieges* S 458

At the same time one must not underestimate the pernicious influence of reactionary imperialist ideology the role of ideology in war, as well as in the life of society as a whole, depends not only on its nature but also on many other conditions First, even false ideas are a serious force if the masses can be made to embrace them Secondly, the reactionary bourgeoisie uses all sorts of ideas for its purposes, it speculates on the attractive force of "the defence of the motherland" slogan, of the ideals of freedom and democracy, and even of socialist ideas Bourgeois ideology resorts to deceit and demagogy, advocates material interest in war, uses the ' red danger ' bogey, etc

However, most important is the fact that the misanthropic ideology of the modern bourgeoisie is embodied in the policies of militant reactionaries This policy is responsible for the formation of imperialist military blocs and for their military doctrines and strategy Therefore, bourgeois ideology has to be fought tooth and nail

Attitude to War of Communist and Bourgeois Ideology

In the modern world a violent struggle is going on between the two ideologies communist and bourgeois This struggle is the reflection in the people s mind of the historical transition from capitalism to socialism An important problem in this struggle is the issue of war and peace and the different attitudes adopted to it in the socialist and in the imperialist camps

Communism brings eternal peace to mankind The most important content of communist ideology is internationalism, humanism, love of peace, the mutual assistance of peoples in all spheres of social life The fighters for communism are inspired by the noble idea of emancipating mankind from exploitation and their actions are directed at imbuing the minds of people with the idea that wars are inadmissible But, as long as there is a danger of war, there must also be a consistent and irreconcilable struggle against the military ideology of imperialism

Being undeniably superior to imperialist ideology in theoretical respects the Marxist Leninist ideology is able to deliver destructive blows to imperialist ideology, no matter what forms it assumes Marxist Leninist ideology reflects objective reality and the needs of current social

development deeper and more accurately than the former

Communist ideology relies on the economic and political system of socialism, which does not carry the seeds of war It is an ideology of friendship and peace between peoples

Imperialist ideology is one of militarism and war, of hatred for the people It reflects the historical doom of capitalism and is false from beginning to end Capitalist society, based on the exploitation of man by man, is torn by irreconcilable contradictions To wage wars the imperialists have to alleviate, to blunt these contradictions and to attain the "unity of the people" This function has been assigned to bourgeois ideology The bourgeoisie is attempting to secure the "unity of the people" by means of ideological deceit of the working people

The inevitable historical doom of the bourgeoisie is of necessity reflected in its ideology and this makes it extremely reactionary and aggressive The ideology of the imperialist states is aimed at concealing the predatory aims of the war, at deceiving the mass of the people and concealing the real causes responsible for war

In all its forms bourgeois ideology invariably faces the contradiction between the true aims of the imperialist war and its ideological justification Contradictions are typical of the stand taken by imperialist states and of the views expressed by the ideologists and statesmen of the military blocs the USA and other imperialist countries have knocked together since the Second World War

Most fatal for the imperialists is the contradiction that stems from the clash between the interests of the people and those of the bourgeoisie It is expressed in the fact that even though modern bourgeois ideology recognises that people play the decisive role in war, it cannot advance ideals in its predatory wars that express the interests of the working people and are able to inspire the soldiers This even the imperialists and their ideological handmaidens have to admit

For example, the ideologists of imperialism understand that a guiding idea should underlie military service, one that would justify the self sacrifice of soldiers and give it a definite sense The NATO journal *General Military Review* writes "Today we live in an ideological age If they are to

survive, the Western nations need an ideology superior to communism The armed forces, too, must have an ideology "[1]

Conversely, the socialist camp is distinguished by the community of aims, views and principles springing from the new social relations and the concord and solidarity of the working people, who have taken the power into their own hands in order to build a new life Communist ideology rallies and inspires the people of the socialist countries in the struggle for the victory of communism and its defence against imperialist aggression

The superiority of communist ideology, both in peacetime and during wars in defence of the socialist homeland, is entrenched in the lofty ideals Communists spread among the masses In peacetime Communists translate these ideas into reality, in wartime they fight in their defence

The heroism of Zoya Kosmodemyanskaya, Alexander Matrosov and hundreds of thousands of other Soviet patriots who sacrificed their lives for their country would be inexplicable without a deep understanding of the role and significance of the sacred ideals of communism They gave their lives for the sake of communist ideals They were inspired by the idea of defending their socialist country, by the grandeur of the aims of this people's war, by their military duty This means that communist ideology plays the decisive role in strengthening the morale of troops

Communist ideology is superior not only to the avowedly reactionary bourgeois theories, but also to various pacifist views Rejecting all wars and insisting on general conciliation, irrespective of the class positions of the sides, pacifism disarms the working people it is not an idea that can exercise a deep and enduring influence The pacifists' appeal to religion, to the Church, does not make pacifism any more convincing

The superiority of communist ideology lies in its popular character

The ideology of the exploiter classes clashes with the interests of the popular masses, the predatory, unjust wars sooner or later reveal the conflict between this ideology and the people's interests

[1] *General Military Review*, April 1960 Paris p 451

Communist ideology expresses the vital interests of the entire working people It relies on the most advanced social system, is inseparably linked with the life of the people, with their activity, with social development Therein lies its invincible force

Communist ideology is permeated with optimism, based on scientific prevision It rejects the pessimistic bourgeois ideology in all its forms, and expresses the inevitable triumph of the forces of progress over the dark forces of reaction

Communist ideology has given a practical demonstration of its historical correctness, its viability and its ability to exert a growing influence on the broad mass of the working people, on the course of historical development It inspires the people for the struggle for the great ideals of commu nism, for eternal peace

5 MODERN BOURGEOIS THEORIES ABOUT THE CAUSES, ESSENCE AND ROLE OF WARS IN HISTORY

Marxists Leninists are waging an active struggle against modern bourgeois ideology, against anti scientific sociologi cal theories about the cause and essence of wars There is a profusion of such imperialist theories This is not surpris ing since there is only one truth, while lies may be innumer able Yet, despite this great variety of bourgeois theories about the war, they all have one thing in common all justify the wars unleashed by the imperialists

Bourgeois theories of war are founded on anti scientific views about the process of history They are based on ideal ism in its various manifestations and, in one way or another, enlist the aid of religion and mysticism They do not adopt a methodologically correct approach to even a single ques tion of the war, and treat the questions of the concrete causes, essence and historical role of wars equally wrongly What all bourgeois theories of war have in common is their class essence all are permeated with anti communism, all serve as a basis for the aggressive policies and aims of the imperialist states

Among the multitude of bourgeois theories it is difficult to discern in a "pure form" theories that look only into the

origin of wars or their essence they generally lump these questions together with interpretations of the causes of wars and their place in social life Imperialist ideologists declare that wars are eternal and inevitable, no matter whether they regard them as accidental or fatally preordained by a supernatural power, whether they look upon them as being beneficial or harmful to mankind

The Theory of Violence

All modern bourgeois ideology is permeated with the idea that force plays the decisive role in history This idea is at the root of most imperialist theories about the causes and essence of wars

This idea is expressed most fully in the so called sociological theory of violence According to that theory war is the main, if not the only, motive force in history Violence is declared the primary factor in all social events and phenomena, even in the economic field The course of history itself is regarded not as a law governed development process, but as one determined fully by military clashes The champions of the violence theory do not recognise any objective laws of social development, and most of them even deny that the human race is progressing

War is proclaimed an eternal and unavoidable social phenomenon, at times even a beneficial force promoting the moral perfection of the human race The theory of the omnipotence of armed violence is the ideological basis of the extremely dangerous adventurism that permeates all politics of the imperialist states and their plans for the preparation and unleashing of new wars

The theory of violence is not new Researchers who looked at history from an idealistic viewpoint have for ages regarded it only as a chronicle of wars, seizures and lootings, of campaigns and battles, of the exploits of various generals and conquerors, kings and emperors In the 19th century this anti scientific view found a champion also in Eugen Duhring, whose views Engels tore to shreds in his famous *Anti Duhring* Now the theory of violence is propagandised particularly insistently by imperialist ideologists to justify aggression and reactionary wars, especially against the socialist countries

Friedrich Nietzsche (1844 1900), the reactionary German philosopher and ideological precursor of fascism, declared

that the "will for power" is the force motivating all histori cal events He preached the cult of violence, openly lauded unrestrained aggression and the destruction of the lower races by "superman the blond beast"

Oswald Spengler (1880 1936), another reactionary Ger man philosopher, wrote that war is the eternal form of su preme human being, and that the state exists for the sake of war

Hitler, who absorbed Nietzsche's and Spengler's ideas, declared in his notorious *Mein Kampf* that brute force is the only "source of right" and the "main factor" in internation al relations Mussolini held similar views

Present day ideologists of imperialism theorise about the "decisive role" of violence which they urge to apply to crush all progressive movements of our day

The English military theoretician J F Fuller asserted that armaments "are the ultimate arbiter in the Age of Power" [1] He defined war as the "dominant factor ' in history " From the earliest records of man to the present age," Fuller believes, "war has been his dominant preoccupation ' [2]

The West German writer on military matters W Picht said in his book *On the Essence of War and the Warfare of the Germans* that "war is a constituent element in the history of all peoples and zones Every culture, every organised form of human community is built on the foundation of war All highest cultures grow out of war "[3]

As a result of the increased aggressiveness of US impe rialism and the development of modern means of destruc tion a new variant of the theory of violence has been put forward and is gaining ground in the USA This new variant is known as the theory of absolute nuclear deterrent According to R Tucker, an American author who made a study of contemporary American military doctrine at the request and expense of the Rockefeller Fund, the essence of the theory is as follows the USA must establish its suprem acy on the globe by using, or threatening to use, nuclear

[1] J F Fuller *Armament and History* New York 1945 p 188
[2] J F Fuller *A Military History of the Western World* New York, 1954 p XI
[3] W Picht *Vom Wesen des Krieges und vom Kriegswesen der Deut schen* Stuttgart, 1952, S 32, 115.

weapons against the socialist countries, and countries in which socialist revolutions are maturing After that the US imperialists want to set up a 'peace and order" in which "force would have a greater importance than ever before", since "peace and the existing order are maintained primarily by threatening with annihilation" of groups of the population showing dissatisfaction with the existing "order" [1]

In their speeches and statements leading US political and military leaders use peaceful phraseology as a cloak to propagandise their notorious "absolute nuclear deterrent" theory But the most aggressive and reactionary elements among the US militarists openly declare their adherence to the basic ideas of that theory General Thomas S Power, the former Chief of the US Strategic Air Command, expounds aggressive fascist views in *Design for Survival* Adopting the reactionary slogan "rather dead than Red" as a symbol of faith, Power comes out in defence of the idea of preemptive war, proposes to use fascist methods in the USA and then to unleash a world nuclear war Propagandising the "nuclear deterrent" theory, this fascist sympathiser in the Pentagon considers "our national policy of deterrence as the only acceptable solution to the problem of *national* survival" [2]

The Pentagon militarists are supported by "civilian militarists" such as Herman Kahn, Henry A Kissinger, Matthew Wohlstetter and Thomas C Schelling, who are insistently advocating nuclear war as a means of imposing the "American system" on the peoples, that is, of establishing world domination by US imperialism [3] The reactionary US press disseminates aggressive militaristic ideology *Time* magazine attempts to prove that wars are important and inevitable because there always have been wars in the past and there are wars at present

The theory of violence insistently advocated by the militarists is beneath all scientific criticism

Firstly, the course of social development is determined

[1] R W Tucker *The Just War A Study in Contemporary American Doctrine* The John Hopkins Press Baltimore 1960 pp 191 97

[2] General Thomas S Power USAF (Ret) with Arnhym *Design for Survival* New York 1965 pp 69 101

[3] I L Horowitz, *The War Game*, New York 1963, p 189

not by violence, not by wars, but by objective social laws Imperialists cannot wipe out these laws with guns, missiles or nuclear bombs, especially since not only the capitalist, but the socialist countries too, possess all these weapons Second ly, violence has never been the ultimate aim, but only a means of achieving the aim The aim is determined by the economic and political interests of the state and of definite classes within it Thirdly, victory or defeat in wars, that is, the results of violence, are determined by the balance of strength of the belligerents, which in the final analysis is determined by their economic development and socio politi cal systems The establishment of US domination over the world by means of force is a wild, reactionary and utopian idea

The champions of the violence theory are unable to answer the question why force is used and what are the sources and causes of wars For this reason modern bourgeois sociologists and military ideologists endeavour to strengthen and reinforce the violence theory with other, no less ground less sociological theories

The "Saving of Civilisation" Theory

The "saving of civilisation" theory is one of them It camouflages the vio lence idea and proclaims that US capi tal is the only force capable of "saving" civilisation

In the view of US reactionary ideologists the saving of civilisation boils down to the establishment of US domi nation

This was frankly admitted by R Strausz Hupé, who said that "if it were not for the power of the United States, Western culture would be no more American hegemony is the condition of its survival" [1]

The theory of the "saving" of capitalism was most fully formulated in *A Forward Strategy for America*, published in 1961 Its authors, the US sociologists Robert Strausz Hupe, Stefan T Possony and Colonel William R Kintner are among the most militant ideologists of anti communism The book was approved by the Foreign Service Institute of the US State Department prior to publication

The authors attempted to explain the need of "saving"

[1] R. Strausz Hupé, *The Zone of Indifference*, New York, 1952, p 149

capitalism by the thesis that a war against the communist world was a "war in which the ultimate stake is national survival" [1] Using slanderous anti communist arguments, Strausz Hupé, Possony and Kintner wrote that "the very existence of so aggressive and dynamic a force as commu nism imperils the survival of democracy [i e, capitalism *Author*] everywhere" [2]

Blinded by their hatred for progress, the fascist minded advocates of anti communism openly declared that the USA must pursue more ambitious aims than the "saving" of capi talism, namely, the victory over communism and "world leadership" by the USA " As the first step in assuring the survival of free societies" (that is, the capitalist countries), they proposed to "defeat the communist movement" in those countries, and then to destroy the socialist states [3]

The ideologists of anti communism and war unanimously aver that any relaxation in the arms race brings up the ques tion of the "life or death" of civilisation They need this in order to lend the narrow class aims the monopoly bourgeoi sie will pursue in the war against the Soviet Union a semblance not only of "socially useful" aims, but even of aims "vitally" necessary to the interests of society as a whole

Essentially the "saving of civilisation" theory is thus reduced to the thesis about the alleged possibility of elimi nating the progressive social achievements of the socialist and national liberation revolutions by military means In other words, they believe it not only possible but even essen tial to counter the operation of objective laws and the require ments of social development by means of armed force, especially by means of weapons of mass destruction, and in this way to perpetuate the existence of the capitalist system under the aegis of US imperialism

William Z Foster, an outstanding leader of the Commu nist Party of the USA, convincingly proved in his book *The Twilight of World Capitalism* that the US monopoly bour geoisie linked the salvation of moribund world capitalism with the violent establishment of world domination by the

[1] R Strausz Hupé, W Kintner, S Possony *Forward Strategy for America* New York, 1961 p 315
[2] *Ibid*, p 402
[3] *Ibid* pp 29, 119 20, 405.

USA [1] But the facts show that imperialism is unable to stem the tide of history

The warmongers attempt to conceal the true causes of the arms race and their aggressive designs with phrases about "saving civilisation" The successes in economic devel opment, science and technology, culture and the arts in the USSR and other socialist countries nail the lie that the so cialist revolution brings with it destruction of civilisation The socialist system is superior to the capitalist system in economic, political and spiritual development and, hence, accelerates the advance of civilisation Only socialism en sures massive participation in all fields of life, a rapid growth of material production, an advance in welfare and an unprecedented flourishing of the peoples' creative powers

The achievements of the countries of the socialist com munity are a guarantee of peace and the peoples' security It is the decayed capitalist system and the reactionary policy of the imperialist states that pose a real threat to civilisation

The striving to save capitalism fuses into one the impe rialist theory of violence and the ideology of anti commu nism and serves to prepare and justify new wars, notably against the socialist countries

Racialist and Chauvinist Views on the Sources and Nature of Wars Cosmopolitanism

The race theory alleges that mankind is divided into "higher" and "lower" races, and that the war between them is the motive force of history, the "higher" races inevitably vanquish the "lower" and have a "legitimate right' to rule over them, to enslave them and even to destroy them Militant bourgeois chauvinism has its roots in the out and out reactionary race theory It is aimed at sowing enmity between peoples, at inciting them against one another At present the race theory and chauvinism serve to prepare a war against the Soviet Union and other socialist states, and also against the peoples fighting for full liberation from co lonial oppression

Racialism in its most aggressive and barbarous forms was the official ideology of nazism Hitler used the Nietzschean racialist ravings about "superman", about the caste of "the

[1] William Z Foster *The Twilight of World Capitalism* New York 1949 p 12

elect" to justify aggressive wars and the destruction of peo ples The German nazi racialists preached the "superiority" and "purity" of the "Aryan race", whose mission, they al leged, it was to rule over all other peoples, whom they declared a "slave race"

Racialism is obviously an anti scientific theory Biology to which the racialists like to refer shows that there is no proof of any natural superiority of some races or peoples over others

All races and peoples have equal abilities for develop ment, while their different levels of development are due not to the anatomic or physiological properties of some peo ples, as the racialists aver, but to the economic and socio political conditions in which they live If there really were an eternal "hierarchy" of peoples depending on their abili ty for progress, some people would throughout history have been advanced while other peoples would, by the same token, have always been backward Actually, however, we observe a clearly pronounced uneven development in histo ry while some peoples are more advanced in one epoch, others, belonging to a different race, excel in another

The thesis of the race theory that wars are a "struggle of the races" is no less unfounded

The racialists aver that war in human society is identical with the struggles in the animal kingdom To reinforce the thesis they often turn to "social Darwinism" a reactionary and anti scientific theory according to which historical events, particularly wars, have their root in the law of natur al selection It should be noted that this theory has nothing in common with Darwin's teaching, who opposed racialism, national oppression and inequality

Now it is used by bourgeois sociologists to justify capital ist exploitation and imperialist war as a form of "natural struggle for existence"

Weilgart, a US sociologist, wrote "Darwin thought a century ago that nature used a constant war in order to im prove the race He thought that only a constant 'struggle for existence' would ensure the 'survival of the fittest' These ideas, radicalised by Nietzsche and popularised by politi cians, have influenced Hitler's philosophy and justified his brutality If now we try to build up a biology of peace, we have to admit that there is some truth in them "

The pseudo scientific arguments about an analogy between

the struggle in the animal world and the wars in human society hold no water. The struggle between animals is dictated by biological laws, notably the law of natural selection, while wars are due to the division of human society into classes.

The striving of racialists to explain victory or defeat in wars by the racial traits of the warring people is nonsensical. The Germans won the war against France in 1871, but lost it in 1914-1918, they won a series of victories over some European states at the beginning of the Second World War, but nazi Germany was routed in the end. Does that mean that the racial characteristics of the Germans changed on three occasions? The outcome of wars depends not on biological causes, but on socio-political conditions and economic factors.

In the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union the Marxist-Leninist ideology of the friendship and equality of all peoples and of all races and nations won a historical victory over the nazi racialist, chauvinist ideology. History cruelly punished the most ruthless aggressors, these misanthropes who attempted to apply the racialist theory in practice and organised the planned, systematic destruction of the peoples whom the nazis relegated to the "lower" races.

The international situation in which the modern pretenders to "world leadership" are acting differs radically from the pre-war situation, when because of some alleged "special" biological racial features aggressors could openly claim the "right" to rule "inferior" peoples. Now the myth about the "superiority" of the select race is being daily refuted by the outstanding successes in the building of socialism, and in the national liberation struggle, by the rapid economic and political development of many countries which until recently were colonies. The peoples of those countries have given practical proof of their ability to make their own history.

As a result the theoreticians and propagandists of aggressive war have changed their attitude to the race theory, at least outwardly. While conducting their anti-communist campaign, they simultaneously oppose the race theory and even racial discrimination in words though not in deeds, for imperialism is unable to establish a real equality of nations.

The leaders and ideologists of modern imperialism attempt to conceal their racialist views because they have obviously

been compromised Instead of references to human biology they now prefer to speak of the "psychological community' and the "mental superiority" of the population of some bourgeois states, or, even more frequently, of a definite imperialist coalition, over the peoples of other countries

The racialist and nationalistic ideology they have rejected in words alone is still used to educate the younger generation in the USA, Britain, The Federal Republic of Germany and other imperialist states It is generally made to serve the home demand Cosmopolitanism, which is externally opposite to racialism and nationalism, but actually supplements it, is used by them for the "export market"

Formerly it was possible to rouse the masses to a war for a redivision of the world by fanning up chauvinist and racialist ideas But in preparing war against the socialist countries, when the bourgeoisie has to unite all the forces of the capitalist world, chauvinistic and racialist ideas about the "superiority" of the Anglo Saxons or the Germans, and about the "superiority" of the white race over the black and yellow races in general, are inimical to its wish to strengthen NATO, SEATO, CENTO and other blocs, which widely use the human reserves also of the colonial and dependent countries for the purpose of preserving and expanding the rule of the oppressors Bourgeois ideologists therefore resort to cosmopolitanism a reactionary theory propounding in difference to the motherland, the rejection of national sovereignty, and disregard of patriotism

Modern cosmopolitanism is distinguished by its clearly expressed anti communist content and anti Soviet aims, the intense propaganda of the slogan of "world government" on the basis of "Western solidarity", etc

Konrad Adenauer, for example, wrote "The age of national states has come to an end We in Europe must break ourselves of the habit of thinking in terms of national states "[1] From the "convulsions of nationalism" in which he sees the "travail" of a "universal world order", Strausz Hupe draws the conclusion that by the year 2000 a "world government" will be established [2]

[1] K Adenauer *World Indivisible with Liberty and Justice for All* New York 1955 pp 6 7

[2] W Posvar and Associates *American Defense Policy* Baltimore 1965 pp 23 24

Proceeding from similar cosmopolitan principles bourgeois ideologists maintain that the state sovereignty of nations is the source of wars In this cosmopolitan theory on the origin of modern wars we clearly see the old racialist thesis that the striving to war between nations is endemic in the nature of nations

As regards its content cosmopolitanism is nothing but bourgeois nationalism racialism turned inside out The preachers of cosmopolitan ideas never advocate an equal union of nations and states, on the contrary, they develop the idea of the rule of one ' elect" nation over all others The cosmopolitan idea of "world state" is nothing but a disguise for the striving of the biggest imperialist powers after world domination

Malthusianism on the Sources and Purpose of Wars

Malthusianism, an anti scientific, misanthropic theory, derives its name from parson Malthus, an English reactionary economist, who in his book *World s Hunger An Essay on the Principle of Population* (1798) advanced the theory that the production of means of subsistence grows in an arithmetic progression while the population grows in a geometrical progression From this false theory he drew the conclusion that mankind would never be able to satisfy its material wants

Proceeding from the Malthusian teaching on the fatal inevitability of overpopulation, modern bourgeois sociology disseminates the thesis that the "population pressure ' is the source of wars Many Malthusians have attempted to prove that wars, epidemics and starvation are necessary and even beneficial phenomena, since they help to eliminate "surplus population '

Under imperialism the Malthusian conception of war has been spread far and wide and has become the basis of the German nazi and Japanese militaristic *Lebensraum* (living space) theory According to this theory Germany and Japan, supposed to be overpopulated countries, have a natural and legitimate right to seize the territories of other countries

The authors of many variants of the Malthusian theory (Elmer Pendell, William Vogt, Robert C Cook, F Pearson, F Harper, and many others) endeavour to prove the "neces sity" and ' usefulness" of a sharp decrease in the world population which is to be brought about by means of war

Advancing the idea of the "inferiority" of the Eastern peoples, cultivating contempt for the fate and vital interests of the bulk of the world population, the neo Malthusians attempt to justify on "moral" grounds the use of mass destruction weapons " It must never be forgotten that overpopulation, with the consequent threat of starvation, is one of the really fundamental causes of war," the American William H Hessler wrote "We must add the fission bomb to the list of potential techniques of population control "[1]

Strausz Hupe, Possony and Kintner also regard the "population pressure" as one of the main causes of modern wars [2]

By declaring that the poverty of the working people in the capitalist and colonial countries is the main cause of wars, the Malthusians deliberately confuse cause and effect The root cause of imperialist wars is not the poverty of the ex ploited, but the concentration of enormous national wealth in the hands of the exploiters

Theory and practice have refuted the Malthusian theory of population It has been proved that every socio economic formation has its specific demographic laws The Malthusian idea that the means of subsistence grow slower than the population is completely unfounded The source of the relative overpopulation and unemployment in bourgeois society is not an abstract law of population, applying in all epochs, it is capitalist relations of production, under which a large part of the population, notably in the colonies and dependent countries, is condemned to hunger and poverty

The modern Malthusians aver that the prime problem, that of raising the living standards of the world population, can be resolved primarily by military means, through the mass destruction of people These "theoreticians" substitute biological laws for the laws of social development and endeavour to prove that wars are caused by the excessively rapid growth of the population, which, they insist, it is impossible to sustain At the same time it is obvious that only in the remote pre historic past could the insufficiency in foodstuffs be the cause of an armed attack by one ethnic group

[1] W Hessler *Operation Survival* New York 1949 pp 37 38
[2] R Strausz Hupé W Kintner S Possony *Op cit* pp 2 3

upon another In modern times wars are fomented by the capitalist system and imperialist policies

True, a large portion of the people inhabiting our planet is systematically undernourished and at times subjected to starvation, but this is not the result of overpopulation it is one of the grim consequences of capitalist rule The complete elimination of hunger and the raising of the people's welfare are not a military but a social problem It is resolved not by imperialist war, but by a socialist reorganisation of society and the destruction of the shameful colonial system

Geopolitics on the Sources and Essence of Wars

The pseudo scientific theory of geopolitics is closely linked with the theories of violence, racialism and Malthusianism It maintains that the policies and the strategy of states are determined by geographic factors Geopolitics justifies imperialist expansion, proceeding from the anti scientific thesis that it is not the economic system and not the politics of the exploiter classes, but the geographic conditions that are the prime cause of annexationist wars States are regarded by the geopoliticians as biological organisms which must grow and expand at the expense of the territories of other states, or go under

Among the founders of geopolitics in Europe were the German geographer Friedrich Ratzel (1844 1904), the Swedish geographer Rudolf Kjellen (1864 1922) and the English geographer Halford Mackinder In the early 20th century Mackinder created a geopolitical scheme for the conquest of world domination, which the geopoliticians considered absolutely correct right up to the end of the Second World War That scheme regarded the Russian Empire as the main geographic region ensuring domination over the world Mackinder called this region the "heartland", saying that he who rules Eastern Europe, rules the "world island' (Europe, Asia and Africa), and ultimately the whole world

Major General Karl Haushofer (1869 1946), the leader of the geopolitical school in nazi Germany, was greatly influenced by Mackinder and expended a great deal of energy to formulate a strategy for the conquest of the Soviet Union Haushofer and his followers told the Germans for years on end that they were a "people without space" and that Germany could not exist without the conquest of *Lebensraum*

The founder of geopolitics in the USA was the military

ideologist Admiral Alfred Thayer Mahan (1840 1914) He believed that there existed a causal relationship between geography and war In his view the domination of the USA on the seas and oceans evolved directly from the geographic position of the USA "The demands of our three great sea boards," Mahan said, "are calling for the extension "[1] Military aggression was, according to him, an inevitable law of progress, a manifestation of Christianity as a political system, the right of the stronger [2]

After the Second World War the ideas of Mackinder, Haushofer and Mahan were developed in the USA by such reactionary ideologists as Strausz Hupé, Possony, Kieffer, Hessler and others In the 1960s US military thought declared that Mackinder's conception of a "world island" was not only 'baseless" but also "fallacious and dangerous" [3] The sociologist geopolitician Nicholas J Spykman, like William H Hessler and James M Gavin, both authors on military matters, and some military journals opposed that conception

Modern US geopoliticians declare that North America and not Eurasia and Africa should be considered the "world island' In their view he who rules North America must rule the world The new geopolitical scheme was obviously evolved to underpin the aggressive policies of US imperialism with at least some semblance of a scientific basis But this was precisely what the geopoliticians did not succeed in doing since they themselves refuted the main conclusions of the geographic arguments used by their predecessors Thus, against their own will the geopoliticians confirmed in their works that geographic factors have no connection with the true causes of aggression

The emergence in geopolitical science of a new "world island", without a change in physical geography, has proved that the aggressiveness of some imperialist power or other is determined not by its geographical position

The principal thesis of geopolitics that the geographical position of a state determines the nature and aims of its

[1] A T Mahan *The Interest of America in Sea Power Present and Future* Boston 1897, p 51

[2] A T Mahan *Armaments and Arbitration* New York 1912 pp 117 118

[3] *Military Review* Vol XXXV August 1955 p 7

foreign policy and is the cause of wars between countries, while war ensures the "natural growth' of the state, does not stand up to criticism

The geographical position of most countries has not changed noticeably for centuries, but their policies have The most convincing proof of this is the example of the Soviet Union The tsarist government conducted many aggressive wars in the interests of the landowners and the bourgeoisie, while the Soviet state, defending the vital interests of the working class and the working peasantry, consistently fol lows a policy of peace and decisively works for banning war from the life of society At the same time there have been no substantial changes in the USSR's geograph ical position Hense, it is not geography but the socio pol itical system that determines the content and character of a state s foreign policy

Psychological Theory on the Essence and Sources of Wars

The champions of the psychological school of bourgeois sociology endeavour to explain war by man s psychology They say that the striving for violence and the thirst of wars are inherent in human nature The psycho sociologists thus underpin the violence theory with a 'psychological basis" Actually, this is hardly necessary, for the champions of the violence theory hold such a viewpoint themselves

A collection published in the USA in 1951 bore the characteristic title *World Tension Psychopathology of International Relations* It contained articles by bourgeois psychol ogists and sociologists from different capitalist countries who attempted to apply the "knowledge of individual psycho pathology to social problems" One of the authors, William C Menninger, declared that war was a psychosis Nicola Perrotti wrote that the behaviour of world groups, partici pating at present in the conflict, resembled the psychology of the neurotic A M Meerloo believed that the symptoms of mental diseases provided the key to an understanding of modern international relations

Even in the bourgeois countries many psychologists refute the thesis about the supposed inborn striving of people for war Thus, as early as the beginning of the thirties, the members of the US Psychological Association were asked "Do you as a psychologist hold that there are at present in

human nature ineradicable, instinctive factors that make war between nations inevitable?" Of the 528 members of the association, 346 answered "no", 22 replied ambiguously, and 150 did not reply at all.[1]

In 1957, the International Sociological Association published at the request of UNESCO the book *The Nature of the Conflict. Studies of the Sociological Aspects of International Tensions.* It gives a review of the most widely spread views on the sources of international tension. The book notes that the absolute majority of social psychologists have now refuted their former view that the "tensions" of individuals are inborn or instinctive, and regard them as a result of experience and of disorders connected with the living conditions of the individual. Social conflicts, however, are still considered by bourgeois psychologists to be a manifestation of the subjective qualities of man's psyche. Wars are explained by the striving of individuals to relieve the tension, the "cultural medium" imposed on them by acts of open violence. Pear, one of the authors of the book, considers the problem of international tension and of the banning of wars not a political but a psychological problem, since wars are waged by individuals, and peace and co-operation too are products of the activity of individuals.

The above arguments of the proponents of a "psychological explanation" of the sources of wars convincingly prove that their theories are completely groundless. The policy aimed at preparing and unleashing aggressive wars is conducted despite the basically peace-loving psychology of the people. In fact, once an imperialist state adopts the secret decision to prepare for a war, it itself begins to influence the psychology of its citizens by chauvinistic propaganda, the fanning up of a war psychosis, etc. This could be observed on the eve of the Second World War in nazi Germany. The same is happening in our time in the imperialist countries. Hence, it is not the chauvinistic psychology of the individual that is the source of wars, but it is the aggressive policies of the states that are the source of the chauvinistic passions, which are artificially cultivated by these states in their citizens.

---

[1] John M. Fletcher, "The Verdict of Psychologists on War Instincts", *Scientific Monthly*, XXXV, August 1932. Quoted from Q. Wright, *A Study of War*, Vol. II, Chicago, 1944, p. 1198.

Irrationalism is a feature typical of the psychological theory of war According to this theory, wars have their roots in man s subconscious strivings, in the mysterious abysses of the human mind, which are beyond reason, are not subject to control by reason and permit no scientific analysis

This viewpoint often draws close to pure mysticism It is particularly typical of the philosophers and military ideologists of West Germany

In his book *On the Essence of War and the Military Affairs of the Germans*, W Picht says ' War is the phenomenon of human existence that is most difficult to comprehend It is the most mysterious vital condition in the mysterious environment we live in "[1]

"By demony," Lothar Rendulic wrote in his book *Dangerous Limits of Politics*, "we understand the actions of mysterious and of horribly potent powers that are completely beyond comprehension to our mind, powers that attract people by their devilment and which they are unable to realise "[2]

The fact that the military ideologists of modern imperialism have to resort to mystical nonsense shows that it is not easy for them to draw the masses into a new war for their reactionary purposes

Clerical Conceptions About the Origins of Wars

The champions of aggression and war are increasingly turning to religious theories and dogmas They use every opportunity to underpin every military adventure with a religious basis

There has never been an imperialist war in history in which religion did not play the infamous role of supporting the "yellow devil ' monopoly capital, which was sending millions of people to death

One of the main theoretical sources of religious propaganda in support of imperialist wars is the Bible, which makes it possible to interpret war as ' God s weapon" for the struggle against "evil ' and the punishment of ' sinners"

The supporters of the militarists from among the clericals got around the commandment "Thou shalt not kill", which

[1] W Picht *Op cit* S 4

[2] L Rendulic *Gefahrliche Grenzen der Politik*, Salzburg 1954 S 160

is incompatible with the propaganda of war and aggression Professor Harold D Lasswell of Chicago University, a major expert on the techniques of military propaganda, laid special emphasis on the widest dissemination of the argu ments of the preachers and priests, who are willing to explain how you can both "follow Jesus' and "kill your enemies" [1]

During the Second World War the clericals diligently strove to prove that this was possible, ignored accepted religious canons and relied on an obviously anti scientific interpretation of the sources of wars The religious leaflets disseminated among the US armed forces explained why God allowed the Second World War to happen as follows First, war logically evolves from man's free will The tolerance of war by God is connected with his tolerance of evil in general War is the result of the evil intentions of people But why, then, does God allow evil at all? He does so because if man did not have the power to be evil he would not have the power to be good The door must be open to make justice possible Until Jesus returns to earth (that is, till Doomsday) the evil of war is periodically allowed to make people hate evil and repent

After the Second World War the criminal bloc of mili tarists and clericals the representatives of the Catholic, Protestant and other Churches did not relinquish but further consolidated its positions in many imperialist countries

The reactionary clericals consider destructive nuclear war a 'divine punishment", and those preaching it, as also all sorts of war mongers, are portrayed as executors of "God's will'

Since there is no God, war cannot be a result of "divine will' However, the idea of some "supreme being", possess ing "supernatural powers", is still very much alive in the consciousness of millions of believers 'God," Lenin wrote "is (in history and in real life) first of all the complex of ideas generated by the brutish subjection of man both by eternal nature and by the class yoke ideas which *consolidate* that subjection, *lull to sleep* the class struggle "[2]

The clerical preachers of war constantly "perfect" their

[1] H Lasswell *Propaganda Technique in the World War* New York London 1927 p 97

[2] V I Lenin *Collected Works* Vol 35 p 128

idea of God They have endowed Him with the prerogative and ability of punishing sinners with nuclear weapons

The latest revelations of the clerical obscurantists express the innermost interests and archreactionary aims of the imperialist bourgeoisie, which are eternally to preserve class oppression and the exploitation of man by man

The bourgeois theories and views on the causes, essence and role of war in history are as far from science as the sky is from the earth They are inimical to the vital interests and progressive strivings of all of mankind

The false, pseudo scientific theories about the nature and sources of wars are ideological weapons that have enabled the imperialists to draw peoples into the two sanguinary world wars which have exacted a heavy toll from mankind The imperialist bourgeoisie continues to preach these immoral theories in order again to deceive the peoples and to draw them into new military adventures

The exposure of the reactionary essence of these theories is an important part of the ideological struggle against militarism and war

Chapter Two

THE SOCIAL CHARACTER AND TYPES OF WARS IN THE CONTEMPORARY EPOCH

The question about the political content and social character of every single war should be resolved on the basis of the Marxist Leninist principles about the essence of wars, and their economic roots and social sources These principles are highly important for defining the political line the working class and all the working people should adopt towards each concrete war in our time

1 JUST AND UNJUST WARS TYPES OF WARS

The socio economic conditions responsible for the emergence of wars, their political aims and the historical role they play in the life of society are extremely manifold 'Wars," Lenin said, "are a supremely varied, diverse, complex thing One cannot approach them with a general pattern"[1] there must be a concrete analysis of every war Every military conflict, evolved by the contradictions existing in definite historical conditions, has its specific features and differs from all others At the same time the fact that every military conflict has its own specific features does not mean that all of them should not be given a social evaluation in accordance with the class character and political aims of the belligerents

The consistent use of the Marxist principle of concreteness

[1] V I Lenin *Collected Works*, Vol 35 p 273

in an analysis of the class nature of war makes it possible to reveal its specific political content and social character To determine the political content of war means to establish its class character, to establish the reason that led to its out break, what classes are waging it, what historical and historico economic conditions are responsible for it A study of the content and aims of the policies pursued by definite classes and states long before the outbreak of war enables us to determine the character of the war even before its outbreak Such an analysis is very important for it enables the prog ressive classes to adopt a correct attitude towards the war, that is, to decide whether to support or oppose it

The Social Character of War

The political content of war determines the historical role it plays in the life of society Depending on their political content wars can have a progressive or reactionary influence on the development of society It is this division that makes Lenin's principle of the political content of war so valuable in theoretical and practical respects

The political content of wars and their division into just and unjust ones are organically interlinked All moral appraisals of historical phenomena in antagonistic societies have a class political sense That is why the moral political characteristic of a war expresses its class nature The charac teristic is not arbitrary, it reflects the objective role each war plays in the concrete historical conditions Just wars are distinguished from unjust ones by the progressive or reac tionary, liberating or aggressive aims of the belligerents

Any war that is waged by a people for the sake of freedom and social progress, for liberation from exploitation and national oppression or in defence of its state sovereignty, against an aggressive attack, is a just war

Conversely, any war unleashed by the imperialists with the aim of seizing foreign territories, enslaving and plun dering other peoples, is an unjust war Such wars, continuing the policies of the imperialist bourgeoisie, are aimed at holding back by violence the logical course of social devel opment, to suppress the revolutionary liberation movements of the oppressed classes and peoples, and to strengthen the exploiter system

Lenin always said that there is a close connection between the legitimacy and justness of wars and their progressiveness

He wrote that 'there are just and unjust wars, progressive and reactionary wars, wars waged by advanced classes and wars waged by backward classes, wars waged for the purpose of perpetuating class oppression and wars waged for the purpose of eliminating oppression "[1] Reactionary, aggressive wars cannot be just, and unjust wars retard historical progress

Just wars have progressive aims The political content of a just war is to liberate a people from oppression and exploitation, which hold back socio economic development

In this connection it is important to bear in mind that progressive wars waged by the premonopoly bourgeoisie have always exhibited also aggressive unjust tendencies, sometimes these became so important that they changed the social character of the war, transformed it from a war of liberation into an aggressive war This happened, for example, with the wars France waged at the end of the 18th century, and in the Franco Prussian war of 1870 1871 Even today the capitalist countries may in definite conditions conduct progressive wars, but the imperialist tendencies of bourgeois policies always assert themselves

Thus, in the Second World War the armed forces of Britain and the USA fought the fascist aggressors in the anti Hitler coalition in a war that had a progressive political content At the same time the Anglo American ruling circles impeded the development of the liberation movement of the peoples in the occupied countries in every way, obstructed the complete eradication of fascism, and sabotaged the opening of a second front in Europe They endeavoured to draw out the war and to weaken the Soviet Union

In all antagonistic formations, both in war and peace time, progress is achieved through the ruin and oppression of the working people, at the expense of their blood and sweat " History," Engels said, "is about the most cruel всѣх богинь (of all goddesses *Tr*) and she leads her triumphal car over heaps of corpses, not only in war, but also in 'peaceful' economic development "[2]

It would therefore be erroneous to regard all historical events that had progressive consequences as just One must

[1] V I Lenin *Collected Works* Vol 29 p 343
[2] *Engels to N F Danielson* February 24 1893

not confuse the political aims of a war with its results, must not judge about the character of a war from its historical (remote and indirect) consequences, these consequences are often not a result of the war itself, but of other socio economic, political or cultural factors Among them a special role is reserved for the movement of the masses, who rise to fight for their interests, which are opposite to those of the exploiters, the instigators of war

The concept of just war can be applied first and foremost to the revolutionary liberation wars of the oppressed classes and peoples against their oppressors, to the struggle of the working class and other working masses for national independence, democracy and socialism Such wars, caused by the increasing scope of arbitrary imperialist actions and violence, become an essential instrument for the destruction of the reactionary forces which are obstructing historical progress Even though all wars involve privations and destruction, revolutionary wars help to regenerate political life. and accelerate the course of social development

The question about the legitimacy and justice of revolutionary liberation wars must not be confused with that of the rationale of using military means in the struggle for national independence and social progress The oppressed classes and peoples take to arms not of their own will They are compelled to do so by the exploiters The working class, the working masses rise for the life and death struggle against the oppressors only when peaceful means are insufficient to abolish exploitation and oppression, or when there is an aggressive attack from without In those cases the just, liberation war acquires the character of counteraction by the people to aggression, exploitation and violence by the reactionary classes

Objective Criterion of the Social Characteristic of Wars

In defining the social character of wars in their time, the founders of Marxism proceeded from the class interests of the proletariat and all working people, which were conditioned by the specific features of the period of premonopoly capitalism

The most characteristic wars of that time were bourgeois progressive, national liberation wars, which were expressions of the peoples' struggle for their liberation from foreign oppression and for the formation of national states Being

bourgeois democratic as regards its economic and class content, the national movement in the West European countries then played a historically progressive role without the destruction of the feudal absolutist establishment, without the liberation and unification of the oppressed nations working class's struggle for socialism could not have developed

During that period there could as yet be no talk of a general proletarian movement against the bourgeoisie in all the belligerent countries Therefore, in defining their attitude to war, Marx and Engels considered the victory of the bourgeoisie of what country would be less harmful (or more useful) to the world proletariat and advocated the adoption by the working class of a policy that would in every way promote bourgeois democratic changes and the creation of conditions for the successful development of the proletariat's revolutionary movement

Taking into account the historical tasks of the wars of that period, Marx and Engels characterised them as either *defensive* or *annexationist* They attached a *political* sense to these concepts, having in mind the liberation or annexationist aims of the war They justified defensive wars, which were resolving such progressive tasks as the liberation of peoples from foreign oppression and the formation of national states, and called upon the working class to support them At the same time they condemned aggressive wars aimed at oppressing the peoples and preserving the obsolescent reactionary establishment and condemned the initiators of such wars

From the first days of its rule the bourgeoisie waged not only liberation wars against feudalism and foreign oppression, but also annexationist wars to seize foreign lands and enslave foreign peoples Among them were the colonial wars waged notably by the British bourgeoisie in the Middle East, in India, Burma, China and other countries Marx and Engels characterised these anti popular, reactionary wars as *most unrighteous wars* The aggressive policies of the bourgeoisie fanned up the thirst for loot and chauvinistic passions, which to some degree poisoned the minds of the whole population in the metropolitan countries This strengthened the position of the exploiters, served them as a means not only for the political but also for the spiritual oppression of the working people

Such was the character of the wars waged by the bour

geoisie in the period of premonopoly capitalism This period was terminated by the Paris Commune the revolutionary struggle of the French workers against foreign aggressors and internal reactionaries Marx and Engels distinguished this struggle, which had a consistently progressive and just character, from the national wars waged by the exploiter classes, for the Commune was to serve as a weapon for abolishing class exploitation as well as the economic basis on which this exploitation is founded

After the Paris Commune bourgeois society entered upon a new stage The development of capitalist monopolies, the rule of finance capital and the creation of the colonial system of imperialism greatly changed the political content of the wars waged by the bourgeois states The monopolists' main aim became the redivision of the colonies and world domination, suppression of the growing revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and the national liberation movements in the colonies and dependent countries

The deepening of social contradictions called for a new approach to the definition of the character of wars, one in keeping with the new tasks of the mass revolutionary liberation struggle In the imperialist epoch the proletariat has become the historically advanced class fighting for further social progress Its ideas coincide with the basic interests of all working people, all oppressed nations In the growing liberation struggle the working class marches in the vanguard of the working people and of all progressive forces It resolves the historic task of the revolutionary destruction of the system of social and national oppression most completely and most consistently

That is why the interests of the proletariat's revolutionary movement and its struggle against capitalism have become the main criteria of all international events, including wars In our time the legitimacy and justice of wars can be approached only from the standpoint of the proletariat and its liberation struggle *The social character of every modern war must be determined from the standpoint of the interests of the proletariat's socialist revolution and the national liberation revolutions of the oppressed peoples, from the position of the main driving forces of social progress the world system of socialism, the international working class movement and the peoples' national liberation movement*

This reflects the objective regularity of mankind s revo lutionary transition from capitalism to socialism Taking this regularity and the new relation of class forces into account, Lenin creatively developed Marx s principle of the political approach to the definition of the social character of wars He worked out a general moral political principle, which can be used to establish a social characteristic of all wars, and clearly formulated the class criterion of this principle in the new historical epoch

The need for developing the Marxist definition of the character of wars is conditioned by a number of circum stances

Firstly In the national wars of the epoch of premonopoly capitalism the belligerents pursued different aims one side pursued aggressive, the other liberation aims Therefore, the former division of wars into aggressive and defensive ones corresponded to the political content of these wars In the imperialist wars for the redivision of the world, typical of monopoly capitalism, there are no sides "defending them selves', since the war waged by both bourgeois groupings is annexationist and reactionary

Secondly The leaders of the Second International attempted to apply these concepts to a characteristic of the political aims of the imperialist states participating in the First World War They used the slogan of "defence' to conceal the aggressive aims of that war Thereby the oppor tunists finally distorted the concept of defensive war in the new historical conditions To eradicate social chauvinism and to formulate new tactics of the working class in wars, it was necessary to get rid of outmoded concepts and to characterise the wars in the imperialist epoch in a new way

Thirdly The unprecedented scale assumed by the world conflict made this a question of cardinal importance The many millions of people who were drawn into the imperialist struggle had to have a clear cut political orientation In these conditions the division of wars into just and unjust ones became crucial for defining the political line of the working class, for mobilising the working people in support of just civil wars and against unjust imperialist wars

Only the Marxist Leninist theory provides an objective, strictly scientific basis for a moral political appraisal of wars

in keeping with their political content By virtue of its correctness such an appraisal has an enormous mobilising and organising force Embodied in a moral principle, it expresses the attitude of the working people towards war the all out support of just liberation wars and decisive opposition to injust, aggressive wars

Attitude of Marxist Parties Towards Just and Unjust Wars

A Marxist must establish the character of a war in order to decide what attitude he should adopt towards it The Marxist Parties decisively call for struggle against aggressive, unjust war by all and every means, including revolution They support revolutionary liberation wars waged by the peoples for national independence, democracy and socialism 'Socialists," Lenin wrote in 1916, "always side with the oppressed and, consequently, cannot be opposed to wars whose purpose is democratic or socialist struggle against oppression "[1]

Defending historical progress and freedom, the Communist Parties mobilise the working people of the capitalist countries for the struggle against the predatory policies of the bourgeoisie They reveal the causes of imperialist wars, expose the secret of the 'birth of wars , and show the masses the way out of wars unleashed by the exploiters

The Marxist Leninist Parties of the socialist countries mobilise the material and spiritual forces of their states to check aggressors and to prevent nuclear war They work for the peaceful solution of all controversial international issues and condemn war as savage and barbarous At the same time Communists support the working class' revolutionary struggle and that of the oppressed peoples for liberation from exploitation, for national independence and social progress The CPSU and all Soviet people actively oppose all and every aggressive war, including those between capitalist states, and also local wars aimed at strangling the peoples' liberation movement, and consider it their duty to support the noble struggle of the oppressed peoples, their just liberation wars against imperialism

The Soviet people decisively support the Vietnamese people in their heroic struggle against the criminal aggression of

[1] V I Lenin *Collected Works* Vol 23 p 196

US imperialism They are firmly convinced that the just cause of the Vietnamese people will triumph The Soviet people fully support the just struggle of the peoples in the Arab states against Israeli aggression and against Israel s imperialist patrons

Marxists Leninists adopt a concrete attitude to every war, depending on the class aims pursued by the belligerents In this Marxism Leninism differs radically from the bourgeois pacifist ideology, which rejects all wars, including revolu tionary liberation ones The champions of the pacifist ideology hold that the preaching of peace alone leads to an abolition of wars without struggle Therefore, the pacifist ideology is not dangerous to the militarists, it can be used by the reac tionary classes to blunt the vigilance of the masses

The exposure of the illusory nature of pacifist ideology is an essential condition for the further development of the organised movement of the peace champions, for their con solidation in the struggle for peace and the security of peoples At the same time all the opponents of unjust wars should be supported in every way, united and drawn into the struggle against the threat of war

The imperialists assign a special role to the Right socialist parties in preparing aggressive wars During the preparation of the Second World War the imperialist governments extensively used the splitting activity of the Right socialists, their hatred for the Soviet Union As a result of the anti communist policies of the Social Democratic leaders, Ger many's working class was unable to form a united front against nazism, to prevent Hitler's coming to power and to rise up in protest against the unleashing by the nazis of the most reactionary war in history

At present some Right Social Democratic leaders also directly support annexationist wars, especially wars against the socialist countries, against the liberation movement of the oppressed peoples or the newly independent states

At the same time the fact that the resistance to the policies of the Right leaders is growing in the Social Democratic parties should not be ignored The forces standing for unity of action by the working class, by all working people in the struggle for peace, democracy and social progress are increasing Marxist Leninist Parties expose the ideological positions and the Right opportunist practices of the Social

Democratic leaders and induce the Social Democrats to go over to positions of consistent class struggle against the poli cies of the imperialist bourgeoisie

The contemporary Right revisionists distort the Marxist appraisal of wars They depart from working class positions and ignore the fact that the working people adopt funda mentally different attitudes to just and unjust wars Under the cloak of "impartiality" they substitute abstract pacifism for the class standpoint, and at the same time conceal the fact that imperialism is the only source of war danger In this way the revisionists, just like the Right socialists, disarm the international working class movement in the face of the aggressive forces of imperialism

Extremely dangerous are also the views of the Chinese splitters, who in the evaluation of wars stand on positions of great power chauvinism and nationalism The Chinese rulers maintain that the world revolutionary process can develop successfully only by means of wars Using Leftist phrases they call not for the struggle against war, but for a new world war, regarding it as a positive historical phenomenon

The international working class and the socialist states can pursue a correct policy in the struggle against imperialist aggressors, for enduring peace, national independence, democ racy and socialism, only on the basis of the Marxist Leninist conception of the character of modern wars

Social Basis for the Classification of Wars into Types

The decision as to whether the war waged by each of the belligerents is just or unjust is indissolubly linked with the classification of wars into types

The types of wars are determined in accordance with the main features of the epoch One cannot understand a given war without understanding the given epoch Every historical epoch is marked by specific contradictions, differing as regards social content *A classification of wars takes into account the main contradictions or the aspects of those contradictions that are responsible for the military conflicts, and also the social forces clashing in the armed struggle*

Not only individual antagonistic formations, but also different periods of the same formation (for example, capital ism) are marked by specific contradictions These determine the basic types of wars in a given period National wars,

expressing the long drawn out struggle of peoples for their liberation and the formation of national states were typical of premonopoly capitalism Imperialist wars for the redivision of the already divided world and for world domination (unjust on the part of both warring sides) were typical for the period of the undivided rule of imperialism

The types of wars in our time are determined by the main lines taken by the social struggle These lines are the struggle between the two world social systems socialism and capitalism, the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, the general democratic struggle of the popular masses against monopoly associations, the national liberation struggle of the peoples against the colonialists, the struggle between capitalist countries for strengthening the positions of monopoly capital *The main, decisive line of the social struggle is the struggle between socialism and imperialism*

All these lines of the social struggle express the deep antagonistic contradictions which the imperialists want to resolve by force of arms From them evolve the main types of wars in the contemporary epoch 1 wars between opposing social systems, 2 civil wars between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, including wars against the reactionary forces of monopoly capital for general democratic aims 3 wars between colonialists and the peoples fighting for their independence, and 4 wars between capitalist states In our time there can also be military conflicts between developing countries (the conflict between India and Pakistan in 1965 1966) provoked by the imperialist and domestic reactionaries

The main types of wars rarely emerge in a "pure" form, several types often intertwine and one type changes into another Thus, civil wars often combine with the struggle against foreign interventionists, while aggressive, reactionary wars can become civil wars in the belligerent countries National liberation wars of the oppressed peoples against the colonialists may also go hand in hand with the civil war against the internal reactionary forces But such combinations do not remove the distinctions between the main types of wars

In classifying wars into types we regard every war as a two sided phenomenon, in which each warring side pursues different social objectives [1] The types of wars express not a

[1] Except imperialist wars, which are unjust on both sides

distinction in kind, that is, one between just and unjust wars, but the *historical* features of wars arising out of the main contradictions of the given epoch If, on the other hand, we speak of the *kinds* of wars, we draw a distinction between just and unjust wars These two *sorts* of wars, each individually are themselves subdivided into kinds which correspond to the nature of the social forces whose struggle determines the main types of wars For example in unjust wars we may include the following kinds imperialist intervention and aggressive wars against the socialist countries, civil wars of reactionary forces against the revolutionary classes within the country, colonial wars against the oppressed peoples or newly independent states, wars between imperialist powers or aggressive attacks by the imperialists on other capitalist countries

Wars differ not only as regards political content, but also as regards the military technical basis of the armed struggle In the age of nuclear missiles the consideration of the military technical character of the war acquires great importance for understanding the historical role of nuclear war in the life of society Wars are also distinguished by the scale of the military conflict between separate countries or between world coalitions of states

The classification of wars according to military technical features only is typical of bourgeois military theoreticians This is because it is unprofitable for them to reveal the class essence and the aggressive character of the military policies of imperialism They therefore confine themselves to a technical classification of wars, ignoring their class political content A typical example of this is the Maxwell Taylor s book *The Uncertain Trumpet* which lays the foundation for the flexible response doctrine according to which the imperialists are to wage wars of differing scale and apply the most diverse technical means of warfare

In framing modern US strategy three kinds of wars are taken into account 1 total and limited (as regards scale and aims) nuclear wars with the participation of countries belonging to the opposing social systems 2 world and local wars without the use of nuclear weapons 3 local wars against the national liberation movement of the peoples and the newly independent states

The imperialists resort ever more frequently to local wars,

which are limited as regards territory and the means of armed struggle applied By waging such wars they attempt to strengthen their position in different parts of the world and to weaken the working people's revolutionary liberation movement Lenin exposed the essence of "little wars" and revealed their indissoluble connection with bellicose imperialist policies Half a century ago he wrote " . .take the history of the little wars they waged before the big war 'little' because few Europeans died in those wars, whereas hundreds of thousands of people belonging to the nations they were subjugating died in them, nations which from their point of view could not be regarded as nations at all (you couldn't very well call those Asians and Africans nations!), the wars waged against these nations were wars against unarmed people, who were simply shot down, machine gunned ...

"The present war is a continuation of the policy of conquest, of the shooting down of whole nationalities, of unbelievable atrocities. . . ."[1]

Lenin's evaluation of "little" imperialist wars is still relevant today It helps to understand their essence and the danger they constitute to social progress A little imperialist war may grow into a world war which is not limited as regards its scale and the technical means of warfare involved The "escalation" strategy the intensification of aggressive military actions in a local war which is an official doctrine of the US ruling circles, inevitably leads to an extension of military conflicts and aggravates the danger of a world war

2 WARS BETWEEN OPPOSING SOCIAL SYSTEMS

The victory of the Soviet Union in the Second World War, the formation of the powerful world socialist camp and the disintegration of the ignoble colonial system have brought about historical changes in the international situation The monopoly dominated sphere has considerably contracted and this has led to a sharp intensification in the aggressiveness of the imperialist states The US monopoly bourgeoisie has become the main bulwark of aggression and international reaction

[1] V I Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol 24, p 406

The aggressive actions of the US imperialists found a clear expression in the aggressive war against the Korean People's Democratic Republic, in the organisation of counter revolu tionary plots against Cuba, in the barbarous bombing raids of the US interventionists of the territory of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam All these aggressive actions have the character of armed clashes between states with opposing social systems imperialism and socialism and are part of the overall imperialist plan of preparing a new world war

Social Character of the World War Under Preparation by the Imperialists

At the end of the forties the US im perialists launched a feverish arms race Counting on the monopoly of atomic weapons they began to knock together military blocs, to build nuclear bases and to improve the armed forces with a view to enabling them to carry out aggressive and military police functions

From this moment onwards the threat of a destructive war has been hanging over the socialist countries and the whole world The US monopoly bourgeoisie constantly inculcates the peoples with the idea that a world war against the USSR and the whole socialist camp is inevitable "Between the free West and the communist movement, there can be no recon ciliation, no real coexistence The confrontation is absolute . . The defence of civilisation is tantamount to the destruction of the communist movement throughout the world "[1]

Hatching criminal plans of an aggressive war, US imperial ism is continually stepping up the arms race, attempts to stir up the activity of the military blocs created for aggression against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, inten sifying the ideological struggle against them and endeavours to hamper their economic development

But imperialism is unable to recover the historical initiative it has lost, or to reverse the modern world developments It is quite obvious that the reactionary political aims of the imperialists are adventuristic They contradict the objective laws of social development Therefore the nuclear war im perialism is planning against the socialist community with the aim of stopping the forward march of history will be

[1] A Burke, "Power and Peace", *Orbis*, Vol VI, No 2, Summer 1962, pp 197, 198

regressive as concerns its social role and most reactionary as regards its political content On the part of the peoples of the socialist states and of progressive mankind as a whole, it will be a holy war for freedom and independence, a just libera tion war Such a world war will be a violent and tense struggle between opposing social forces, a class war on an international scale

Because of this sharply pronounced class character the political and military aims of the sides at war will be decisive and the use of nuclear weapons will lend it an unprecedent edly destructive character A thermonuclear war would kill hundreds of millions of people, lay waste entire countries, inflict irretrievable losses to material and spiritual culture Mankind would be thrown back for many decades

To lull the vigilance of the peoples, the US militarists are discussing the possibility of limiting the nuclear war The prudence of the opponents, they say, will make it possible to "co ordinate" their nuclear strikes and to limit the targets against which these weapons would be aimed According to the Western military "theoreticians" such limitations will reduce the destruction of material values and the privations of the peoples to a minimum

The deliberate falsehood of these assurances is easily exposed The propaganda of "limited wars is intended to pacify public opinion, to accustom people to the thought that nuclear war is possible At the same time all talk about con fining nuclear strikes only to military objectives is intended to camouflage the plans for a preemptive war (first strike) against the socialist countries

The peoples of the world cannot rely on the chance that the imperialist aggressors will be "prudent" and will establish certain limits to the use of nuclear missiles Their efforts must be concentrated on reining in the imperialists before it is too late, on depriving them of the possibility of applying death dealing weapons, on *preventing thermonuclear war.*

The relation of the class political forces and the organisa tion and conscious will of the people are crucially important to a solution of the issue of war or peace In modern condi tions the struggle by the progressive social forces can play a decisive part in averting war The international working class, the most consistent fighter against imperialist wars, has a great organisational role to play in this struggle of all the

people The unity of action by the world proletariat, the international unity of all forces of socialism are of decisive importance to the struggle for peace and for the freedom of peoples, for the progressive development of human society

"An extremely important form of the struggle against the threat of imperialism starting another world war," Leonid Brezhnev said, "is to organise a collective rebuff to the actions of the aggressors whenever they launch military adventures in any part of the world The most striking example of this is the rebuff which US aggression has received in Vietnam "[1]

Imperialism no longer holds a dominant position in international life, the role of the socialist system has grown, as has also the influence exerted by the newly independent states and the mass of the people in the capitalist countries Conditions are shaping in which new norms in international life can triumph over imperialist aggressive policies

The new type of international relations is expressed in the foreign policy of the socialist states These relations are founded on the principle of equality and sovereignty of all countries, on the principle of peace and security of the peoples The peace loving policy of the socialist countries is permeated with ideas of genuine humanism It is called upon to ensure mutually advantageous co operation and friendship between the nations Socialism has offered mankind the only rational principles of interstate relations at a time when the world is divided into two systems the principle of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems, that was advanced by Lenin

It is the internationalist duty of the world working class to support the peace loving policy of the socialist states, their constructive proposals, directed at relaxing international tension, at consolidating peace "The defence of peace is inseparably linked up with the struggle to compel the imperialists to accept peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems "[2]

For the policy of peaceful coexistence to be implemented there must be decisive action by the mass of the people against imperialism

[1] *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, Prague, 1969, p 144

[2] *Ibid*, p 30

Should it turn out to be impossible to foil the criminal plans of the imperialists and should a war break out, it will be the holy duty of the international working class movement and of all of progressive mankind to use all and every means to render the aggressor harmless as quickly as possible, to disarm him and to stop him from escalating the destructive war The sooner and the more resolutely the peoples will do away with the reactionary system of imperialism, the smaller will be their sacrifices in the war

The World War and the Socialist Revolution

The basic law of the socialist revolution, as clearly formulated by Lenin, states that revolution breaks out in every capitalist country in the presence of a direct revolutionary situation arising out of a deep national crisis and of all the objective and subjective conditions for a revolutionary upheaval

The socialist revolution relies not on plots, not on the arbitrary actions of separate organisations, but on the strength of the advanced class and on the political activity of the working masses Only the enemies of socialism can stupidly insist on an "export" of revolution, on an encroachment by world socialism by means of force on the "free institutions" of the capitalist world Revolution is not made to order but ripens in the process of historical development and breaks out at moments conditioned by a whole complex of internal and external factors

War is not an essential element in that complex, is not the decisive condition for revolution, there is no simple and direct link between war and revolution Imperialist wars do not always lead to revolution and not every revolution is preceded by a war Yet, war and revolution are not isolated political phenomena There is a definite connection between them This connection manifested itself most clearly in the First and Second World Wars, which exerted a major impact on the revolutionary process

World war exacerbates the internal and external contradictions of capitalism, erodes the state apparatus of the bourgeoisie and gives rise to a deep political crisis of the whole system of imperialism War raises the people's political awareness, creates the conditions in which the working people rise to struggle against the bourgeois system The trials of war and the heavy toll of human lives the unjust war exacts

objectively impel the people to revolution Lenin meant this when in 1917 he said that world war inevitably leads to revolution

Already the First World War revealed the obvious incompatibility between the interests of the people and the government of every warring country It sharply exacerbated the class contradictions of capitalist society, brought on a deep all embracing crisis that undermined the socio political basis of imperialism According to Lenin the First World War "created such an immense crisis, has so strained the material and moral forces of the people, has dealt such blows at the entire modern social organisation that humanity must now choose between perishing or entrusting its fate to the most revolutionary class for the swiftest and most radical transition to a superior mode of production" [1]

Having collected in a single focus all the contradictions, the war weakened the world capitalist system, awakened the masses, drew them into political life, raised them to independent historical action It created favourable conditions for the proletariat's revolutionary struggle for the state power

Under these conditions it is the internationalist duty of the Marxist Parties to reveal the social contradictions deepened by the war, to mould the class consciousness of the working people, to rally the proletariat of all countries in the struggle against imperialism, against the culprits and initiators of the war

During the First World War Lenin said that from the viewpoint of social progress the reactionary war conducted by the monopolists to strengthen the system of wage slavery can be opposed only by a war of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, notably a civil war for the destruction of capitalist rule The consistent struggle for the transformation of imperialist war into a civil war was the only correct tactics the working class and its party could adopt This tactics has lost none of its pertinence today, but, of course, the concrete international situation and the relation of forces must be considered before it is applied

The Second World War fully confirmed the correctness of Lenin's proposition that the choice of the forms and methods

[1] V I Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol 25, pp 363 64

of the anti war struggle depends on the specific features of the prevailing situation An upshot of the struggle of the imperialists for world domination, this war threatened the peoples with enslavement and therefore roused many millions to intense political activity Already the first months of the war revealed the deep rooted contradictions between the will of the peoples and the reactionary aims of the British and French governments The progressive forces in those countries demanded that the German fascist aggression should be decisively rebuffed, but the governments strove to make a deal with the nazis, refused to take decisive military action and adopted a wait and see policy This contradiction determined the entire political situation during the initial period of the war, which came to be known as the "phoney war"

At the same time, considering the reactionary aims of nazi Germany, which threatened to enslave all the peoples of the world, the Communists of Britain, France and other bourgeois states could not advance the slogan of the defeat of their governments and the transformation of the imperialist war into a civil war This slogan did not correspond to the existing political and military situation and would only have promoted the aims of the nazis In the conditions prevailing during that period of the war, the Communist Parties in the bourgeois democratic countries had to strengthen the anti fascist general democratic front and to expose the conciliatory positions of the ruling circles, their attempts to come to terms with the nazi clique and to join the anti Soviet bloc

While the contradictory nature of the Second World War led to the adoption of specific tactics by the proletariat, it did not remove the class struggle in the capitalist countries of the anti Hitler coalition The selfish aims of the monopolists, their policies of dragging out the war and their attempts to use the armed forces to strangle the national liberation movement caused dissatisfaction on the part of the working people and intensified the class struggle

In most European countries, occupied by the nazis, the anti fascist war of the peoples assumed the character of a revolutionary struggle This was a result of the alignment of the class forces in the national liberation movement The exploiter classes of such countries as Czechoslovakia, Poland

and Yugoslavia either co operated with the aggressors or looked for guidance from the émigré governments which had betrayed their people

The capitalists and landowners were afraid of a nation wide struggle against the nazis and did everything they could to obstruct it The patriotic forces who embarked on war against the invaders clashed with the reactionary classes at home It would have been impossible to complete the struggle against the nazi aggressors without first smashing the domestic pro fascist forces

The national liberation war in those countries inevitably combined with the struggle for a revolutionary transforma tion of the socio political system The task of national libera tion was indissolubly linked with that of the social libera tion of the proletariat and of all the working people Without national liberation from nazi oppression it would have been impossible to carry out the democratic tasks and to introduce radical social reforms At the same time the war for national liberation of necessity included the revolutionary struggle of the democratic forces against the pro fascist elements within the bourgeois democratic countries

World war exerts a different influence on the maturing of the revolutionary crisis in the different capitalist countries It is generally stronger where the states at war pursue an unjust, aggressive policy In that event the conflict between the people and the governments that have unleashed the war becomes particularly sharp But the action of this general regularity depends on the course of the military operations, the morale of the people, the organisation of the working class, the political regime in the country, and on many other factors

In nazi Germany, for example, despite the reactionary character of the war, the immiserisation of the people, the enormous number of victims and the defeats at the front, there were no social forces capable of overthrowing the nazi system The ideology of racialism poisoned the minds of a large part of the German nation it was unable to free itself from nazi reaction on its own One of the reasons why the heroic efforts of the Communists, who showed the way out of the war and to the alliance of the anti nazi elements, did not lead to the necessary results was the refusal by the Social Democratic Party to form a united front with the

Communists in the struggle against the nazis Only the rout of the nazi armed forces freed Germany from Hitler's tyranny

Thus, the maturing of a revolutionary crisis and the further fate of the revolutionary movement in the capitalist countries drawn into the Second World War, were determined by the sum total of the internal and external factors in every individual country The anti fascist war objectively evolved the need for far reaching revolutionary changes of all aspects of social life The implementation of these changes in each country was determined not only by the internal relation of class forces, but also by the military and political situation shaping in the course of the Second World War

Historical experience has confirmed that not war but the social contradictions and the development of the class struggle within countries are the mainspring of revolutionary transformations In definite conditions world war intensifies the activity of the working people and urges them on to revolutionary action

However, while world wars under some conditions may rouse the masses to struggle, they may under different conditions temporarily restrain the revolutionary process Historical experience shows that the military way for the development of the world revolutionary process is neither the most universal nor the easiest one A revolution following a war connected with war or flaring up during a war, is "a particularly painful birth" of the new social system War disorganises the economic life of a country, affects the social processes, the consciousness and morals of the people, teaches them to resolve political problems by means of armed force, and makes the building of socialism more difficult

If previous wars with conventional weapons had such an effect, what will be the effect of a possible thermonuclear war on the revolutionary process? Undoubtedly, a new world war, should it be unleashed by the imperialists, will bury the capitalist system But the cause of the struggle for socialism throughout the world is linked with peace, not war War is not necessary to develop the world revolutionary process and to ensure the triumph of socialism throughout the world Only adventurists, who care nothing for the fate of historical progress, can say that development impelled by war is more desirable to the working class than the peaceful competition

between countries with different social systems, which is leading to the triumph of communism Peace and socialism are indivisible socialism creates the socio economic basis for the peaceful co operation of peoples, and peace promotes the development of the world revolutionary process and the triumph of socialism in all countries

3 CIVIL WARS BETWEEN THE PROLETARIAT AND THE BOURGEOISIE, BETWEEN THE PEOPLE AND THE REACTIONARY FORCES OF MONOPOLY CAPITAL

Class struggle is the law governing the development of class antagonistic societies As it grows in scale and depth. it becomes a political struggle for the state power, and in definite conditions assumes its sharpest form civil war The reactionary forces attempt to suppress the revolutionary action of the masses and to preserve their rule by force of arms They resort to violence, to civil war

Civil war is the armed struggle between the antagonistic classes of a country, a struggle for the state power by means of violence As regards its political content it may be progressive and just on one side, may be a continuation of the revolutionary struggle of the oppressed classes for their social liberation. and unjust on the other side, a struggle pursuing the counter revolutionary aims of returning the reactionary class to power or of consolidating its political domination

Socialist Revolution and Civil War

The revolutionary struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat includes the exertion of open political coercion on the exploiters, but does not necessarily involve armed struggle Wars between states do not necessarily precede a socialist revolution nor are all revolutions accompanied by civil war Armed struggle is not essential in all countries to establish the proletarian dictatorship and to implement socialist transformations in the economy and social relations

Naturally, the capitalists do not renounce their class privileges and their political rule voluntarily They fiercely resist the revolution The intensity of the class struggle, its forms and methods of violence during the transition to socialism depend not so much on the proletariat as on the

resistance offered by the exploiters, on whether or not the bourgeoisie resorts to armed violence The proletariat attempts to use primarily peaceful means for the revolutionary change of the political system Only when it has exhausted all peaceful means and encounters fierce resistance on the part of the reactionary classes, is it compelled to take to arms, to take up armed struggle As early as 1871 Marx warned the bourgeois governments We shall act against you peacefully where this will be possible for us, by force of arms when this becomes necessary "[1]

In 1917, in his famous April Theses, Lenin advanced the slogan of the seizure by the working class of the state power by peaceful means, through the conquest of the majority in the Soviets It was only after the July events, when the troops of the Provisional Government opened fire on a peaceful demonstration of workers in the streets of Petrograd, when the power was usurped by the counter revolutionary bourgeoisie, when all hopes for a peaceful development of the revolution were shattered, that the transition of power to the Soviets became impossible without an armed uprising The Russian proletariat, the first to raise the banner of the socialist revolution, could not avoid armed struggle between the classes The exploiters, who endeavoured to restore the old system, rose in arms against the workers and the poor peasants Under these conditions the socialist upheaval inevitably had to assume the character of a revolutionary civil war

Specific features marked the birth of the new social system in Russia, but they should not be dogmatically extended to other countries, to the entire development of the proletarian world revolution

History knows also of a peaceful transition of the state power into the hands of the working class In March 1919 Soviet power was established in Hungary by peaceful means It existed for over four months This historical experience is particularly important to the revolutionary movement of the European proletariat

In the past the possibility of a peaceful development of the revolution was the exception rather than the rule The reac

[1] *Le Première Internationale Recueil de Documents*, Vol II, Geneva, 1962, p 202

tionary classes commanding the *military* and police forces *within the country* and relying on the assistance of other imperialist powers, prevented the peaceful implementation of revolutionary tasks Now the *considerably greater* strength of the working class, the wider social basis of the revolution and the existence of the powerful socialist community, open up the possibility for a peaceful *transition* of some countries to socialism

At the same time Marxists do not reject civil war in principle, under all conditions and for all capitalist countries When the reactionary classes resort to open violence against the people, a rejection by the proletariat of civil war would be tantamount to a rejection of the struggle for power, a rejection of the revolution In the new situation, too, the proletariat *may find it necessary*, under certain conditions, to use military means in the revolutionary struggle for the conquest of political power Sometimes it is necessary to use arms also to suppress *counter* revolutionary mutinies against the already established proletarian dictatorship, as was the case in Hungary in 1956

The peaceful development of the socialist revolution does not exclude, but rather presupposes, the decisive crushing of all attempts by the reactionaries to restore the old regime When the exploiter classes *resort to military* force to suppress the revolutionary actions of the working people, the civil war of the progressive classes against the reactionary forces becomes historically inevitable

Such a situation can emerge in capitalist countries where the bourgeoisie commands a strong military police apparatus and resorts to fascist methods in implementing its dictatorship Under these conditions the advent of the working class to power will inevitably involve the violent overthrow of the capitalist dictatorship by means of sharp revolutionary struggle and civil war

Main Kinds of Civil Wars

Civil wars have specific features, distinguishing them from other types of wars It would therefore be erroneous to interpret the concept "civil war" too broadly, to include in it all armed actions by the people against their oppressors

The concept "civil war" must not be used to include all armed clashes between workers and police or government

forces The armed resistance by demonstrators or strikers to troops attacking them is not yet a civil war ".. Civil war," as defined by Lenin, "is the sharpest form of the class struggle, it is that point in the class struggle when clashes and battles, economic and political, repeating themselves, growing, broadening, becoming acute, turn into an armed struggle of one class against another"[1]

Civil war can begin before the seizure of the state power by the working class, can attend its struggle for power and can flare up after the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship

The revolutionary struggle of the working class and the working peasantry against the bourgeoisie and the semi feudal reactionary forces in the course of the general democratic revolution often turns into open civil war In 1905 the development of the Russian revolution inevitably led up to a decisive armed struggle between the tsarist government and the vanguard of the class conscious proletariat The reactionary classes, who rose against the growing revolutionary movement, were responsible for it

Armed uprising is a specific variant of civil war In a directly revolutionary situation, when the proletariat attempts to seize the state power, the class struggle assumes a particularly sharp form Military counteraction to the reactionaries to the armed detachments of the bourgeoisie, the police and government troops leads to an armed uprising of the working class against the political power of the bourgeoisie It is generally supported by peasant uprisings and by mutinies in the army and navy

Armed uprising is the most decisive instrument of political upheaval To be successful it must have the support of the progressive class and rely on the revolutionary sentiments of the masses, embrace the country's most important economic regions and political centres The armed uprising is organised by the revolutionary party of the proletariat A classic example of such an organisation was the armed uprising of the workers and peasants, soldiers and sailors, headed by the Bolshevik Party led by Lenin, in October 1917 in Russia

Civil war of the masses, headed by the working class, for general democratic aims and against the armed violence of

[1] V I Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol 26, p 29

the reactionary forces of monopoly capital, is a specific kind of civil war in our epoch

Such was the character, for example, of the civil war the masses in Spain waged against the forces of the bourgeois landowner reaction when it raised a fascist mutiny against the Left Republican Government, which launched a programme of democratic reforms (1936 1938) The mutineers were overtly supported by the Italian and German fascists, and covertly by the monopolies and ruling circles of Great Britain, the USA and other imperialist countries

Civil war for general democratic aims and against the most reactionary forces of society is possible in the less developed countries, where the domination of domestic and foreign monopoly capital intertwines with semi feudal oppression by big landowners, who are setting up reactionary military fascist, tyrannic regimes (the Asian and Latin American countries)

In the developed capitalist countries the exacerbation of the contradictions between the majority of the nation, the people and the capitalist monopolies, often leads to the abolition by the reactionary monopoly bourgeois circles and the militarists of the remnants of bourgeois democratic freedoms by means of reactionary coups This can result in a general democratic revolution and civil war between the masses and the reactionary forces of monopoly capital

While the seizure of power by the proletariat is a decisive defeat of the reactionary classes, it does not deprive them of the power to resist, and they do not stop their attempts to restore the overthrown system Under definite conditions they resort to armed resistance and then the clash between the classes becomes a civil war Under the political rule of the proletariat the aim of the working people in this war is to preserve and consolidate their political power In the new conditions the working class has much greater political and military resources at its command than it had before the revolution it is now able to rely on the state power and the nationalised economy

An example of a civil war in defence of the proletarian dictatorship, against the attempt to restore capitalism, was the armed struggle of the Soviet working people against the counter revolutionary forces in 1918 1920

Civil war is the most acute and decisive form of class struggle Its purpose is to resolve the sharpest social conflicts

Social and Strategic Specifics of Civil War

In such a war the antagonistic forces are particularly sharply demarcated here, as distinct from wars between exploiter states of similar type, conciliation is excluded

Civil war is distinguished by the extreme violence of the class battles, the specific means by which military operations are waged, the rapid change of the methods and forms of armed struggle in keeping with the concrete situation *The main strategic principle of a class war is the offensive, active character of the military operations by the revolutionary forces* The founders of Marxism laid down this principle as applying to armed uprisings of the proletariat

The uprising of the revolutionary classes is generally opposed by well trained government troops, the armed forces of the bourgeois state, while the insurgent masses, or those who have joined the uprising, include a multitude of unorganised people The number of those inert and vacillating, even though they hold sympathies for the insurgents, is even greater Under these conditions the main task of the revolutionaries and their leading party is to take decisive, energetic action to ensure the moral supremacy of the insurgents, to imbue revolutionary passion in the inert and vacillating, and to draw the unorganised masses into active struggle under their leadership

Once the objective conditions have matured and the class struggle has intensified to the utmost, the success of the armed uprising depends on the courage and the offensive spirit of the revolutionary masses and on their assuming the offensive Defensive action spells death to every armed uprising The founders of Marxism Leninism warned never to play with uprising, but "once the insurrection has begun, you must act with the greatest *determination*, and by all means, without fail, take the *offensive* The defensive is the death of every uprising ".[1] Having caught the enemy unawares the proletariat must smash the forces of reaction by its courageous and resolute action and seize the state power

The perfect mastery of strategy by the Communist Party becomes particularly important in open class battles When the class struggle assumes the form of civil war, the Party

[1] V I Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol 26, p 180

becomes the headquarters of the revolution, the organiser of the armed storm, the leader of the revolution, its militant, warring party

The class nature and revolutionary character of the Civil War in Russia made it necessary for the Soviet state to adopt an offensive military strategy The political aims of the Civil War on the part of the working class utterly to rout the armed forces of the class enemies called for active resolute action Only courageous offensive action could lead to the rout of the enemies of the revolution and establish conditions for the building of a new life

These aims evolved the specific features of Soviet military strategy at that time the combination of offensive operations with the unflagging pursuit of the enemy; the rapid change in the methods and forms of armed struggle, the use of various operational and strategic manoeuvres, the rapid regrouping and concentration of forces on the main sectors, etc The offensive operations of the Red Army were closely co ordinated with partisan action The extensive partisan move ment that flared up in the rear of Denikin's and Kolchak's armies and in the Soviet Far East, played a major role in the rout of the domestic and foreign counter revolutionaries

Civil Wars and Armed Interventions by Imperialists

A revolutionary civil war is often closely interwoven with the struggle against the armed intervention by foreign imperialists The reactionary states frequently intervene in the internal affairs of other countries in order to support the counter revolutionary forces and restore the old regime

Interventionists often succeeded in strangling the revolu tion Thus, in 1919, the Entente troops crushed the Soviet power in Hungary In 1936 1939, the German and Italian interventionists fought in the Spanish Civil War, assisting the counter revolutionaries and helping them to set up General Franco's fascist regime. The revolutionary struggle of the Greek people in 1946 1949 was also defeated as a result of the armed intervention by the Anglo American imperialists

The imperialist powers intervene in the internal affairs of the revolutionary countries either by openly invading those countries or by helping to unleash a civil war in them, by supplying the counter revolutionary groups with arms, am munition, food, etc Sometimes, as was the case in Russia in

1918 1920, they support the domestic counter revolutionaries and simultaneously resort to direct military intervention

The Civil War in Russia was begun by domestic counter revolutionary forces But it assumed a wide scale when the foreign interventionists rushed to the assistance of the over thrown exploiter classes Britain, France, the USA, Japan and other capitalist countries generously supplied them with weapons and equipment, and also landed their troops in Russia The imperialists proclaimed a "crusade of 14 states" against the world's revolutionary bastion Soviet Russia could not expect state assistance from outside The solidarity of the international proletariat was insufficient to prevent armed intervention by the imperialists Yet, during the Civil War the international proletariat greatly assisted the Soviet people. It became the decisive reason for the collapse of the campaigns launched against Soviet Russia, in foiling the reactionary plans of the imperialists

The imperialists not only sought to strangle the workers' and peasants' government and to restore the bourgeois system, but also wanted to deprive Russia of her state sovereignty, to dismember her territory and to enslave her peoples Therefore, the Civil War of the working people for the preservation of the proletarian dictatorship was at the same time a *patriotic* war of the Soviet people against the world imperialist bourgeoisie In this just war the working class, together with the working peasantry, defended the gains of the October Revolution and the state sovereignty of their country

The changes in the balance of forces in the world in favour of socialism and democracy have greatly decreased the possibilities of the imperialists to interfere by force of arms in foreign countries Yet this possibility has not been excluded. Playing the role of a world gendarme, the US imperialists constantly threaten to strangle the revolutionary movement of the working people in other countries by means of brute force

This can be seen in particular from the ventures of the US aggressive circles against revolutionary Cuba At first they attempted to strangle the revolution by establishing an economic blockade Later, in April 1961, they tried to achieve this by direct intervention The Cuban people smashed the interventionists The venture of the US imperialists failed But Cuba's enemies are continuing their aggres

sive policies, are making preparations for new armed attacks The socialist countries and all of progressive mankind closely watch the doings of the imperialists and are firmly resolved to fulfil their internationalist duty

The US imperialists are conducting a war against the liberation movement in South Vietnam and pursuing aggressive aims against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam

All this shows that the threat of armed interventions continues to exist Any country whose peoples have risen in the struggle for socialism may become a victim of armed attack by the imperialists That is why it is the duty of the international working class, by relying on the power of the world socialist system, decisively to rebuff the intervention of the imperialists in the affairs of the peoples of any country that has launched a revolution, and in this way to prevent the export of counter revolution by the imperialists

4 WARS BETWEEN THE COLONIALISTS AND THE PEOPLES FIGHTING FOR THEIR INDEPENDENCE

The revolutionary struggle of the working class for socialism is closely intertwined with the national liberation movement of the peoples in the colonial and dependent countries "The socialist revolution," Lenin said, "will not be solely, or chiefly, a struggle of the revolutionary proletarians in each country against their bourgeoisie no, it will be a struggle of all the imperialist oppressed colonies and countries, of all dependent countries, against international imperialism "[1]

The October Revolution in Russia ushered in a deep crisis of the whole colonial system of imperialism It inflicted a heavy blow to the entire system of imperialist colonial rule and was a major stimulus to the development of the national liberation movement A new powerful blow to colonial slavery was delivered also by the socialist revolutions in a number of European and Asian countries after the Second World War Supported by the world socialist system, the liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples for the complete

[1] V I Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol 30, p 159

elimination of the colonial system became an enormous motive force of historical progress The colonial system capitalism had set up to oppress the peoples disintegrated in the conditions marked by the general weakening of imperial ism, the emergence of the world socialist system, the powerful upsurge of the working class and democratic movements, under the impact of the anti imperialist and the national liberation revolutions More than 70 independent national states emerged on the ruins of the former colonial world "*The breakdown of the system of colonial slavery under the impact of the national liberation movement is a development ranking second in historic importance only to the formation of the world socialist system*"[1]

Social Forces of the National Liberation Struggle

The revolutionary national liberation movement is a complex social process in which various anti colonial forces emerge and interact This inevitably gives rise to antagonistic clashes between the interests of the various social and ethnic groups, classes and parties In the course of the struggle for state independence and the solution of general national democratic tasks a union is formed by all patriotic forces of the nation the proletariat, peasantry, national bourgeoisie and the democratic intelligentsia

The working class of the colonies, which are economically poorly developed, is generally weak numerically and frequently insufficiently organised Because of the colonial economy and the low level of the productive forces it has not yet become an independent political force in many African countries There are as yet no conditions for proletarian leadership in them National cadres of the working class form and their political role increases as these countries move towards economic independence and social progress. The semi proletarian masses and the peasants consolidate round the working class in some newly free countries the worker peasant alliance forms the nucleus of the national front, the behaviour of the bourgeoisie, which often plays the leading role in the national front, depends on the firmness of this alliance

The peasantry holds an important place in the mass

[1] *The Struggle for Peace, Democracy and Socialism*, Moscow, 1963, p 61

movement for national independence and social progress Being the most numerous class, it determines the anti feudal, general democratic character of the revolutionary liberation struggle Without the revolutionary movement of the peasantry it is impossible to weed out the remnants and vestiges of feudalism The toiling peasant masses form the powerful social basis for the formation of the revolutionary democratic forces, under whose leadership the weakly developed countries can in modern conditions make the transition to the non capitalist road of development

The national bourgeoisie plays a major role in the liberation movement It has great possibilities for fighting imperialism, its interests do not coincide with those of the foreign monopolies, and the policies they pursue But it includes reactionary elements who endeavour to hold back the development of the liberation struggle For this reason the policies of the national bourgeoisie are inconsistent and double faced It is afraid of a revolutionary upsurge of the popular masses and therefore apt to strike a deal with the imperialists The national bourgeoisie can head the liberation movement only when the question of state independence is being decided Later, as the anti colonial struggle develops and the class contradictions aggravate in the country on the way to liberation, as the economic and political position of the bourgeoisie grows stronger, part of the bourgeoisie becomes ever more inclined to come to terms with the imperialists and domestic reactionaries

The contradictory alignment of the social forces in the national liberation movement complicates the development of the newly free countries The conquest of state independence does not put an end to the revolutionary struggle Life advances new problems linked with consolidating the sovereignty of the young national states Political freedom will be unstable and become fiction if the revolution fails to introduce far reaching changes in social and economic life, and does not resolve the vital problems of national revival

The might of the world socialist system is a decisive factor in the struggle of the peoples in the colonies and dependent countries for their liberation from imperialist oppression The socialist system has become a reliable bulwark on which the independent national development of newly free countries and of dependent and backward peoples can rely.

The contradictory nature of the social forces and the complexity of internal and external conditions are responsible for the variety of forms of the national liberation struggle A special place is held in it by armed uprisings and wars The choice of the methods and forms of anti colonial struggle does not depend on the will of the peoples, but on the degree of violence the colonialists use in their attempt to consolidate their rule

Wars of Oppressed Peoples for State Independence

Thus, for example, the rout of imperialist Japan freed the Vietnamese people from foreign invaders and enabled them to seize the state power But the French colonialists resorted to open aggression against Vietnam, in which they were actively supported by the American imperialists The Vietnamese people were compelled to wage a long armed struggle for independence (1946 1954) Their People's Army gained victory in the northern part of the country and this enabled the Vietnamese people to embark on the building of socialist society there

A similar situation developed in Indonesia after she was proclaimed a republic in August 1945 The imperialists of the USA, Britain and Holland decided to suppress the national liberation struggle of the Indonesian people by force of arms At the end of 1945 British troops occupied several areas of the Island of Java and dealt cruelly with the local population Dutch troops supported by the Anglo American imperialists twice mounted treacherous attacks against the Indonesian Republic (1947 and 1948) In reply to this the Indonesian people unleashed a revolutionary guerilla war against the invaders which ended in victory Later, however, the ventures of foreign imperialist reactionaries, the action of the reactionary forces within the country, the adventuristic course of the Chinese splitters with respect to Indonesia and serious mistakes made by the Sukarno government in the domestic and foreign policy led to the loss by the Indonesian people of their hard won socio democratic gains

The war in Malava was also unleashed by the reactionary imperialist forces The armed struggle began with the repressions against the people by the British troops and the declaration of martial law in the country (1948) A guerilla war against the British colonialists flared up throughout Malaya

In 1949 the guerilla detachments united into the Liberation Army under a single command. The people's struggle was crowned with success: in 1957 Malaya became an independent state. However, Britain imposed upon Malaya a treaty according to which British military bases were to remain in the country.

A national liberation war is always a response to the oppression and violence of the colonialists. The colonial and neo-colonial policy of the imperialists was and remains the source of all popular uprisings and national liberation wars.

The imperialists endeavour to keep the former colonies in economic and social dependence, to impede their social and cultural progress. The peoples, however, do not intend to remain objects of imperialist exploitation.

The Communists have always recognised the progressive importance of liberation wars. The CPSU considers it its internationalist duty to help the peoples who are out to win and strengthen their national independence, to assist all peoples fighting for the complete destruction of the colonial system.

Anti-colonial national liberation wars include: a the armed struggle of the oppressed peoples for their state independence and b the wars of newly independent states against imperialist aggressors attempting to restore the colonial regime.

Anti-colonial wars of the first type directly continue the policies of the revolutionary national liberation movement spearheaded against the remnants of colonial slavery. Examples of such wars are the war of the Algerian people against the French colonialists (1954-1962), the struggle of the Kenyan people against the domination of the British imperialists (1952-1966), and the war the people of Angola are fighting against the Portuguese oppressors.

The national character of anti-colonial wars determines also the methods by which they are waged, the tactical forms assumed by mass uprisings and the patriotic struggle. Frederick Engels, observing the national liberation wars of his time, drew the conclusion that "a nation that wants to win independence must not confine itself to the use of *conventional* means of war. Mass uprisings, revolutionary war, guerillas everywhere—that is the only way by which a small people

can cope with a big one",[1] stand up against a stronger army.

National liberation wars, born of colonialism, generally begin with popular uprisings and the mass spread of the guerilla movement This accelerates the formation of class consciousness among the working people, and helps to mobilise the champions of the struggle for freedom and in dependence The active participation of the population keeps the guerilla movement alive, it is the main condition for ensuring the success of the revolutionary liberation struggle

Once that struggle has reached a definite stage, once strongholds have been set up in the country and the guerillas have been supplied with arms, there arises the task of forming a regular army, one able to extend the scale of military operations, which are to be combined with the operations of the guerilla detachments Regular troops are able to choose more favourable conditions for their operations and to apply flexible manoeuvring tactics, and to wage large scale offensive operations to rout the enemy The distinctive methods of national liberation wars (the specific aims, special intensity of the forms and the variety of the methods applied in military operations, etc) form in the course of the armed struggle

Wars of the Newly Independent States Against Imperialist Aggressors

New sovereign states have emerged and continue to emerge in the former colonies and semi colonies Many of them have firmly stated their opposition to joining aggressive military blocs and are pursuing a consistently anti colonial policy Many others, however, depend on the foreign monopolies and have not yet broken loose from the world capitalist economy, even though they occupy a specific place in it The struggle of the peoples of these countries for economic independence, for the removal of imperialist military bases and strongholds from their territories, etc, is growing increasingly important

Conversely, the main efforts of the colonialists are aimed at keeping the peoples of countries that have freed themselves of colonial oppression within the framework of the capitalist world system The policies of neo colonialism are based on the imperialist striving after the economic enslavement of

[1] Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd 6, Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1959, S 387

the countries that have won political independence Imperialism was and continues to be the chief enemy of the young sovereign states and all dependent countries and the main obstacle to the solution of their general national tasks

Alongside with the policy of wooing the national bourgeoisie in the newly independent states, the imperialists often attempt to intimidate these countries by military means Such military conflicts as the aggression against Egypt, the armed intervention in the Lebanon, the plot against Syria and Laos and the aggression in South Vietnam broke out in connection with the imperialist attempts to prevent the national development of the young states by force of arms The aggressive policies of the colonialists threaten peace and the security of the peoples not only in those countries or in separate regions, but on the entire planet

The aggressive actions of the imperialists against Egypt are particularly characteristic in this respect In 1956 the Anglo Franco Israeli aggressors wanted not only to seize the Suez Canal, but also to destroy the revolutionary achievements of the Egyptian people, to intimidate the peoples of all Arab countries striving for national revival

The aggression against Egypt posed a serious threat to universal peace and security The progressive forces therefore supported the struggle of the Egyptian people The protest of the vast majority of countries and especially the firm stand of the Soviet Union forced the imperialists to cease fire and to withdraw their troops from Egyptian soil

However, in June 1967 the Israeli militarists once again mounted an aggressive attack against the UAR and other Arab states The USA and Britain, without whose encouragement the Israeli extremists would not have dared to start the war against the Arab peoples, are responsible for this aggression

The national liberation struggle has become more difficult because nowadays it is opposed not by a single colonial power, but by a coalition of imperialist states It is obvious that without such an alliance and without its support a country like Portugal, one of Europe's weakly developed countries, would be unable to keep in subjugation her African colonies, whose territory and population are respectively 23 and 1 5 times as large as those of Portugal herself

The aggressiveness of some of the imperialist powers can

be clearly seen in their repeated armed interventions in the internal affairs of the Congolese people The aggressive intrigues of the imperialists are also directed against other African peoples who have recently won national indepen dence, and against all South American peoples who are fight ing for democratic freedom This can be seen from the armed intervention of the USA in the domestic affairs of the Dominican Republic and other Latin American countries "The events of the past decade have laid bare more force fully than ever the nature of US imperialism as a world exploiter and gendarme, as the sworn enemy of liberation movements "[1]

A particularly cynical manifestation of the aggressive policy of US imperialism is the US war in Vietnam The aggressor wanted to suppress one of the socialist outposts in Asia by armed intervention, to deliver a blow to the national libera tion movement, and to test the firmness of the proletarian solidarity of the socialist countries and of the working people of the world However, the plans of the imperialists were foiled by the international solidarity and comprehensive assistance given to the Vietnamese people by the socialist countries, notably by the Soviet Union

"The war in Vietnam is the most convincing proof of the contradiction between imperialism's aggressive plans and its ability to put these plans into effect In Vietnam US impe rialism, the most powerful of the imperialist partners, is suffering defeat, and this is of historic significance "[2]

5 WARS BETWEEN CAPITALIST STATES

Wars of annexation between bourgeois states were a constant concomitant of the making and development of the capitalist system The wars for the division of the world among the capitalist countries were also predatory The foreign policy of the imperialist powers was always an expression of the struggle for world domination In this struggle the military conflicts between imperialists assumed the scale of world wars

[1] *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties*, p 17
[2] *Ibid*, p 13

By the 20th century the world imperialist system had taken final shape Big monopoly associations superseded free competition The struggle between the monopolies outgrew the national boundaries and became a struggle between the chief imperialist powers for a forceful redivision of the already divided world *As distinct from the past, the struggle of monopolies for world domination became the political content of aggressive wars in the imperialist period*

Wars of the Imperialist Powers for World Domination

The world war of 1914 1918 was a typical imperialist war for the redivision of the colonies, for the domination of the monopolists over the world It emerged as a result of a sharp disturbance of the already unsteady balance of forces between the imperialist powers A strong predator imperialist Germany appeared in the arena of the struggle for colonies Germany openly claimed her "right" to the lion's share in the plunder of the oppressed countries The states of the Entente, on their part, also pursued predatory aims They hoped to oust their competitors the German monopolists from the world market

From the first days of the war Lenin and the Bolshevik Party disclosed the deep rooted economic causes and political content of the war They showed the working class of all countries that the war was a predatory, unjust one, an imperialist war for the preservation and consolidation of the exploiter system The bourgeoisie endeavoured by means of war to strangle the growing class struggle of the proletariat in their countries and the national liberation movement in the colonies, to weaken the revolutionary forces by setting up one people against the other

The Bolsheviks, expressing the interests of the international proletariat, advanced the tactics of revolutionary withdrawal from the anti popular war They resolutely exposed the social chauvinists of the Second International, including the Russian Mensheviks, who preached "civil peace" and supported their bourgeois countries in the imperialist war.

Fighting the social chauvinists, Lenin also exposed the bourgeois pacifist idea that it is possible to escape the horrors of war without using revolutionary violence against the imperialists War should be fought not by pronouncing soapy words in condemnation of violence, but by propagandising

the idea of continuing the class struggle also during the war, when the bourgeoisie attempts to poison the minds of the working people with chauvinism Under these conditions, Lenin noted, the socialists faced particularly high responsibility, for their task was not just that of changing war into peace, but also of replacing capitalism with socialism, not only of preventing the outbreak of war, but also of utilising "the crisis created by war in order to hasten the overthrow of the bourgeoisie" [1] Only such revolutionary activity corresponded to the objective laws of social development

The First World War created a revolutionary situation in most warring countries and ushered in the era of social revolutions Under these conditions it was the duty of socialists to develop the workers' class consciousness, to support all revolutionary actions, to conduct a line aimed at transforming the imperialist war between nations into a civil war of the oppressed classes for socialism

These new tactics fully reflected the relation of class forces in the period of imperialism and determined the proletariat's new tasks in the struggle for the revolutionary withdrawal from the world war The internationalists in all belligerent countries were to follow this line in order to destroy imperialism by the concerted efforts of the international proletariat

The 1914 1918 war did not resolve the contradictions of capitalism, it aggravated them The contradictions between the victor and the defeated countries, and also between the imperialist camp and the first socialist country, were added to the former main contradictions those between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, between the colonies and metropolitan countries, and the one between the imperialist countries themselves The contradictions between the two opposing social systems began to dominate international life

The policies of the imperialist states were aimed first and foremost at preparing and unleashing war against the Soviet Union Nazi Germany was assigned an important part in these aggressive plans The monopolists of the USA, Britain and other countries gave her enormous financial assistance and this made it possible to equip the German army with first rate weapons Hitler Germany prepared intensively for

[1] V I Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol 13, p 80

a big aggressive war and her monopolists were hatching plans of establishing world domination

Nazi Germany began the Second World War by invading Poland (September 1, 1939) *While the fault for this war lies with all imperialist powers, with the entire system of imperialism*, its initiator was the bloc of the fascist states, which set itself the aim of destroying the USSR, of annihilating millions of people, of enslaving the peoples of the Soviet Union and other countries The war waged by Germany had a most reactionary and aggressive character, insofar as nazism was world imperialism's most violent and predatory detachment Even before the beginning of the war the Hitlerites destroyed all remnants of bourgeois democracy in Germany, seized a number of European countries and openly proclaimed their intention to enslave the whole world

The reactionary aims of the nazis to deprive all peoples of state independence and the right freely to decide their destiny made this war a mad adventure Lenin emphasised in his time that the existence (and formation) of national states is *typical* of the civilised world The fascist aggressors attempted to suppress this objective trend by crushing the state sovereignty of many European nations. The struggle against this adventure, for the restoration of democratic freedoms and national independence of the peoples was the main task of the enslaved peoples' anti fascist war

The governments of the Western powers pursued different aims They fought not fascist reaction, but their competitors, and at the same time encouraged them to turn their guns against the USSR In nazi Germany they saw not so much an enemy as a class ally in organising a "crusade" against the East

Hence it was not only nazi Germany, but also the Anglo French ruling circles that pursued aggressive, reactionary aims *The war had an imperialist character on both sides* [1]

[1] The Communist Parties gave this appraisal to the war immediately after its outbreak The Appeal of the Executive Committee of the Communist International published on the occasion of the 22nd Anniversary of the October Revolution said "War rages in the very heart of Europe The ruling classes of Britain, France and Germany fight the war for *world domination* This war is a continuation of the perennial imperialist competition in the capitalist camp Such are the genuine aims of that war, an unjust, reactionary, imperialist war" (*Kommunistichesky Internatsional*, Nos 8 9, 1939, pp 3 4)

At the same time the Second World War differed essentially from the First In the latter the warring sides fought primarily for the redivision of the colonies In the Second World War Germany strove to destroy the Soviet Union, to win world domination and to establish a fascist regime in all countries The nazi aggression posed an enormous threat to mankind and condemned many peoples to destruction

Under these conditions the tactics the working class had adopted during the First World War could not be mechanically applied in the bourgeois democratic countries The fight against the nazi "new order" advanced the general national task of consolidating all freedom loving forces to the fore ground. The Communist Parties of Britain and the USA supported the military measures of their governments, strengthened the united national front At the same time they exposed the ignoble designs of the imperialists to draw out the war in order to weaken the USSR and to suppress the Resistance movement

The growing struggle of the peoples in the occupied countries changed the political content of the war It gradually became a war for liberation *When the USSR joined the struggle against nazi Germany, which had treacherously invaded it, this completed the transformation of the Second World War into an anti fascist, liberation war on the part of the countries of the anti Hitler coalition*

The tendency of anti fascist struggle, having become dominant after Germany's invasion of the USSR, had an enormous impact on the further development and the victorious outcome of the war. The treacherous plans of the imperialists could not weaken this tendency. They were given a sharp rebuff by all freedom loving peoples, including millions of people in Britain and the United States, who wanted to continue the war to the utter rout of the German fascist armies

The might of the Soviet state and the unrelenting will of the popular masses were the most important factor for victory The people were the main force in the anti Hitler coalition and it was their active participation that determined the anti fascist character of the war This fact reflects the historical changes that had taken place in the relation of the social forces in the international arena after the triumph of socialism in the USSR

Heading the powerful coalition of the peoples, the Soviet Union played a decisive role in the rout of German nazism and Japanese militarism By its victory it exerted an enormous influence on the social development of the European and Asian peoples No matter how much the imperialists and their ideologists falsify the results of the Second World War, no matter what arguments they use to slander the Soviet Union, they are unable to refute historical truth The victory over the nazi aggressors was won by the joint efforts of many peoples The powerful anti Hitler coalition formed in the course of the war Serious blows were delivered to the enemy by the armies of the Western allies, the allied troops of Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, and the members of the Resistance movement It was, however, the Soviet people and their heroic army that bore the brunt of the war and played the decisive role in the defeat of nazi Germany

The Possibility of New Wars Between Bourgeois States

The main contradiction of today the contradiction between the two opposing social systems does not exclude the other deep antagonisms of imperialism Alongside with the tendency to unite all reactionary forces against socialism there operates also the opposite tendency towards the exacerbation of the contradictions between the imperialist powers

It would, however, be premature at present to draw the conclusion that the forces disuniting the bourgeois states predominate over the forces uniting them One thing, however, is certain, namely, that the plans of the USA to unite the whole capitalist world under its aegis have failed Having restored and expanded their productive apparatus, the countries of capitalist Europe and Japan have become competitors of the US monopolies They have re established the positions they lost on world markets and are stepping on the toes of the USA

In Europe the process of economic integration goes hand in hand with the political disintegration of the West European states and the growth of contradictions between them These contradictions arise when international issues have to be decided and also where these connected with the "internal" problems of the imperialist camp (for example, with the solution of political and military strategic questions

in NATO) come under discussion The contradiction between France, on the one hand, and the USA, FRG and other imperialist countries on the other, led to France's withdrawal from the military organisation of NATO The criminal war in Vietnam has resulted in the moral isolation of the USA, has exacerbated the already existing contradictions and evolved new ones between the imperialist powers

Naturally, acute inter imperialist contradictions between the USA and West European countries, or within Western Europe, do not weaken the class solidarity of the imperialists on both sides of the Atlantic against world socialism and the revolutionary liberation movement However, this solidarity cannot overcome the contradictions of imperialism they emerge from its nature and are a source of wars Although in modern conditions wars between capitalist countries are extremely unlikely, the possibility of their outbreak must not be excluded Under definite conditions the struggle of the monopolists can lead to military conflicts between capitalist states

The possible military conflicts within the capitalist camp may assume the form of an imperialist war on the part of both warring sides, or that of a one sided aggression by a big imperialist predator against a weaker capitalist country, or, finally, of an attempt by some bourgeois country that has become a vassal of foreign capital, to defend its state sovereignty

In the first case both sides would pursue annexationist, anti popular aims, and the war would be unjust on the part of both In the second and third cases one of the sides would (though not consistently) express the interests of the bulk of the population and wage a liberation war

The question arises whether or not in the period of imperialism there can be a just, national war of one capitalist country against the aggressive actions of the other The question of national wars waged by capitalist states was widely discussed at the beginning of the century During the First World War the Left Social Democrats in Germany declared that there can be no national wars under imperialism

Lenin opposed that thesis He held that the definition of the First World War as an imperialist one should not be extended to all possible wars under imperialism, that national movements *against* imperialism should not be disregarded.

Bringing to mind Rosa Luxemburg's view about the possible transformation of national wars into imperialist ones, Lenin showed that the possibility of such transformation does not mean that we should ignore the qualitative distinctions between them and deny the progressive nature of national liberation wars He proved that under imperialism it was logical for such wars to be fought not only by colonial and semi colonial peoples but also by capitalist countries falling victim to aggression by other imperialist states

Even in Europe we must not exclude the possibility of national wars breaking out during the imperialist epoch Lenin wrote in the article "The Junius Pamphlet", which was directed against Rosa Luxemburg's erroneous views, that "this 'epoch' by no means precludes national wars on the part of, say, small (annexed or nationally oppressed) countries *against* the imperialist powers . ".[1] Lenin thought it was possible for a big national war to break out in Europe if several viable national states should be enslaved by a stronger imperialist predator striving after world domination

Such a situation was to take shape two decades later, when nazi Germany violated the national sovereignty of a number of European countries and openly declared her intention to place the world in slavish dependence on the "Aryan race", the German masters All peoples were threatened with enslavement and destruction, and many of them were actually made to suffer by the fascist thugs Defending their life the freedom loving people rose for the great national war against their enslavers In this war the peoples of the world defended their democratic rights and freedom and fought to preserve their state sovereignty

The Second World War demonstrated that in the contemporary epoch bourgeois states can wage national liberation wars, provided they express general national interests Moreover, under definite circumstances such wars are not excluded against new pretenders to world domination

National wars directed against aggressors and oppressors are just, they promote the progressive development of society The slogan of defending the motherland in such a war is both logical and justified It expresses the true interests of the working people and does not contradict the principle of

[1] V I Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol 22, p 311

proletarian internationalism The proletariat cannot remain indifferent to the fate of its country

The Marxist Leninist Parties of the working class are heading the struggle of the peoples for freedom and democ racy against external and internal reactionary forces who are betraying the interests of the nations Such a struggle is legitimate and just, it merges with the broad general demo cratic and socialist movement

6 THE ROLE OF THE POPULAR MASSES IN WARS IN THE MODERN EPOCH

The content of modern wars reveals the operation, in a specific field, of the general sociological law about the grow ing role of the popular masses in the historical process This was illustrated by the First and to an even greater extent by the Second World War, and in the postwar years also by the national liberation, civil and other wars

The participation of the popular masses in wars and their influence on their outcome depend on many circumstances Decisive, however, is the character of these wars, the social and state system under which the masses live and fight, and also the level of the working people's consciousness and organisation

In considering the masses the main force in deciding the outcome of wars, it must be remembered that anti popular forces the reactionary classes participate actively in wars as well, and exert a considerable influence on them The latter are fully responsible for the outbreak of all sorts of wars, including civil and national liberation wars In ex ploiter states the representatives of the propertied, reaction ary classes play the leading role in the armed forces, in the war departments and other state bodies that are responsible for the preparation and conduct of wars and for carrying out all kinds of aggression

In our time the imperialist states alone bear the responsi bility for aggression, and the masses grow increasingly aware that any aggression unleashed by the imperialists can easily spread to other countries, including neutral ones This insistently demands that joint, well organised and diverse methods be worked out for the struggle of the masses against warmongers

The decisive role of the masses in modern wars is determined by the action of social laws, by the whole content of social processes and, finally, by the complexity and inconsistency of the wars themselves

Main Facts Determining the Growing Role of the Masses in Wars

The growth of the role of the masses in modern wars is a general tendency, reflecting processes of historical development This is linked, first and foremost, with the qualitative change of the masses themselves, of their place in material production and in the social structure, their increased political maturity and organisation In the past the power of the masses could not assert itself fully and did not correspond to their numbers by far In every exploiter society the initiative and creative talents of the masses are fettered, they are suppressed by the power of the ruling classes Definite economic and social conditions, the domination of reactionary ideology, chauvinism and nationalism disunite the working people and this has a particularly pernicious effect during wars

Only the emergence of the working class and the spread of Marxism changed this state of affairs substantially As regards its position in production and society, the working class is the most revolutionary of all classes and the only one able to implement the great historic mission of destroying the exploiter system of all forms of class and national oppression Therefore, the struggle of the working class has an essentially international, profoundly humanistic and antimilitaristic character

The class interests of the workers fully coincide with the vital interests of all working people, and the proletariat therefore heads every revolutionary, genuinely popular liberation movement This strengthens the power of the people headed by the working class and its party and the role of the masses in all spheres of social life, including war

A powerful factor promoting an increase in the role of the masses in wars was the triumph of the socialist revolution in Russia and the successes in the development of the world socialist system, which radically changed the character of the epoch Under the influence of the world socialist system and owing to its comprehensive assistance, the activity and role of the masses grew in the weakly developed countries,

where no working class has as yet formed and where there are no Marxist Leninist Parties

The emergence of socialist states and their economic, cultural and military successes not only redouble the moral strength of the working people waging just wars, but are also instrumental in opening the eyes of the peoples drawn into annexationist wars Furthermore, the masses now have the opportunity to rely on modern industry, advanced science, perfect weapons and powerful armed forces The establishment of socialist states and the growth of their military might have led to the emergence and development for the first time in history of a material force able to paralyse and crush imperialist aggression This fact in itself is of enormous international importance Under the impact of the socialist revolution, the victories won by the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War, and the rapid consolidation of the world socialist system, enormous activity has been developed by the peoples of the Asian, African and Latin American countries, where the national liberation movement is growing and consolidating The upsurge of the national liberation movement and the establishment of dozens of new peace loving states in their turn show that a new serious factor has emerged for raising the role of the masses in the struggle against imperialist aggression

Many of the features of modern wars make for the ever increasing participation of the masses Their political content, military technical character, scale, and the course of military operations all presuppose the participation of great numbers of people Essentially, every war, no matter what country it involves or how long it lasts, makes all its citizens participants and it is they who have to shoulder the burden of that war. Modern wars carry off many victims, they put to test the spirit of the entire nation, the whole social and state system These trials will be even grimmer if the imperialists succeed in unleashing a world nuclear war The threat of nuclear war affects the vital interests of every workman and of the people as a whole

The increased role of the masses in the wars of our epoch manifests itself in various spheres in the military, economic, socio political and ideological fields

The type of war determines the intensity of the efforts exerted by the masses and the character of their activ

ity Let us look into this question as applying to the concrete types of modern wars

The Masses in Just Wars

The aim of all just wars is to emancipate the peoples from oppression (national or class oppression, sometimes of both) or to ward off the danger to the country's sovereignty and independence This expresses the vital interests of the masses and determines their activity in such wars This activity is very diverse It is generally expressed in the support given by the masses to all measures of the government and of the ruling party directed at routing the enemy, in their patriotic, conscientious attitude towards their work and their civic duties, which they regard as their concrete contribution to the victory over the invaders During just wars the class struggle assumes new forms in antagonistic societies

In just wars the mass heroism of people on the fields of battle and the guerilla war are of special importance

Guerilla war played a major role already in the past, for example, in Russia's war against Napoleon's invading armies in 1812, in the civil war in the USA in 1861 1865, in the Anglo Boer war in 1899 1902 The guerilla movement developed on a mass scale during the Civil War and the foreign intervention against the young Soviet state in 1918 1920, during the Second World War on the territory of the Soviet Union occupied by the nazi invaders, and also in the Balkan countries, in France, Poland and Italy Guerilla operations created a second and very dangerous front in the enemy's rear, a front against which he had to apply dozens of crack divisions But it was not only a question of the number of troops that the guerillas diverted from the main front They gave an impetus to the growth of the political consciousness among the masses and to the spread among them of the idea of proletarian internationalism This was expressed not only in the organisation of direct assistance to the fighting people the supply of arms, food and volunteers but also in the opening of new fronts against the common enemy in different countries Thus, the movement of national Resistance in France and the guerilla war in the Balkans took on particularly sharp forms when nazi Germany attacked the USSR, while the successes of the Soviet Army and the guerillas, in their turn, promoted the intensification

of the struggle against the common enemy in all other countries subjugated by the nazis

In our time working people the world over give comprehensive support to the peoples of Indochina fighting for their freedom and national independence

The forms of the mass struggle, as well as its scale and depth, vary in different just wars They depend notably on the specific features of the war and, of course, on the alignment of forces in the world and the strength of the working people's international links, on the actions of their allies in the struggle, on the extent to which the combatants are supplied with arms, and on the maturity of the military political leadership

In civil wars the warring sides are demarcated according to the class principle the revolutionary masses fight on one side, their political enemies, on the other However, this social demarcation is not identical in different countries and, hence, the cohesion and strength of the revolutionary people also differ In countries where there is a working class, it is together with the working peasantry the main motive force in civil wars, while the Marxist Leninist Parties are their faithful leaders In such wars the revolutionary masses are a mighty force and their struggle, no matter how difficult, is triumphant in the historical perspective

The composition of the forces of reaction in such countries depends on the internal and external conditions in which the civil war is waged, on the problems it is to resolve, and on the type and kind of the war

In civil wars in which the people fight the ruling pro imperialist clique to attain the democratisation, political and economic independence of their country, the working class and the peasantry are the main strike force A definite portion of the national bourgeoisie, which is dissatisfied with the dominance of big agrarians and the foreign bourgeoisie, helps them in their struggle That part of the national bourgeoisie reckons to some extent with the new relation of forces in the world and with the growth of the working people's political awareness In such wars the enemies of the people are generally big landowners and the upper echelons of the national bourgeoisie standing at the helm of state, who are closely linked with banking and foreign capital

In such cases the masses face extremely difficult tasks to

defeat the united forces of domestic and foreign reaction, having at their command enormous material, including military, resources and vast experience in armed struggle The experience of all recent civil wars demonstrates that this task is achieved where the single leadership of the people's revolutionary struggle relies on the worker peasant alliance, and on the extension of international links with all progressive forces, and where constant care is taken to educate the masses on the basis of their own political experience

In national liberation wars the composition of the participants is generally broader and more diversified than in civil wars The national bourgeoisie is more widely represented in them Even the upper crust is interested in liberation from foreign capital The working masses naturally are the most determined forces in these wars Different layers of the national bourgeoisie act in different ways in national liberation wars The part linked with foreign finance and monopoly capital, which according to Marx's apt expression "has no fatherland", always overtly or covertly betrays the national interests of its country and turns to imperialist interventionists for help This is characteristic of the upper crust of the national bourgeois élite in a number of Asian, African and South American countries, which are fighting for their independence

The majority of the national bourgeoisie is dissatisfied with the stagnation of the country's economy and the domination of foreigners in it and therefore participates actively in national liberation wars and plays a progressive role in them It strives to remove the most active puppets and lackeys of imperialism, to limit the sphere of action of foreign capital, to form its own government and to guide the country along the road of independent national development

The active armed struggle of the masses for national independence is energetically supported by all the progressive forces throughout the world, especially by the countries of the socialist community. Only decisive support by the USSR and other socialist countries has enabled the Arab Republic of Egypt, Algeria and some other countries to win national independence and to embark on the new road of social development The successful heroic struggle of the Vietnamese people against the US aggressors would have been impossible but for the enormous assistance given to them

by the socialist countries and all progressive people in the world The union of the forces of socialism and of the national liberation movement is a decisive prerequisite to success in the struggle against imperialism, for freedom, national independence and social progress

National liberation wars release the revolutionary energy of the people The events in Indochina and the Middle East have shown that imperialist aggression hastens the maturity of the peoples falling victim to it as well as that of peoples in other countries, shows them who is their friend and who their foe. and tempers them in the struggle against imperialism The masses learn from their own experience, they consolidate their ranks and their political consciousness grows This is what the foreign imperialists and the national bourgeoisie fear most of all Therefore, in leading national liberation wars, certain national bourgeois circles attempt to resolve three tasks simultaneously first, to free themselves of the dominance of foreign imperialists, without making a clean break with them, second, to prevent the complete democratisation of the country, which gives rise to antagonisms between them and the revolutionary masses, third, to split the revolutionary forces

The participation of various layers of the national bourgeoisie in the national liberation wars obliges the true leaders of the revolutionary struggle to pursue a flexible policy with respect to the national bourgeoisie in order to spearhead it against the domestic reactionaries and foreign imperialists

The experience of just wars demonstrates that armed struggle alone is not enough to vanquish the enemy The masses and their leadership must use all means and methods of political, economic and ideological action against the enemy The broader the participation of the masses in the war, the more certain is victory Mass participation, for example, explains the victory of the Cuban people over dictator Batista, the creature of the US imperialists The bloody tyranny was overthrown because action was taken by the entire people, who fought it in all fields and used all possible forms armed struggle, strikes, a general strike, the patriotic movement, action by the worker and peasant masses, propaganda and agitation, the boycott of mock elections and the struggle against the agents of the tyranny in various organisations.

The support of just wars by all progressive people in the world, not to mention the working people in the socialist countries, is a major factor in their successful outcome

The Masses in Unjust Wars

Unjust, annexationist wars are anti popular wars The interests of the masses and those of the aggressors are always at odds with each other The masses are a creative force All social wealth has been created and multiplied by their labour Aggression destroys the wealth and ruins the working people Yet, these wars too are waged by the people In the past when annexationist wars were unleashed, the working people generally exhibited little activity because they were for various reasons politically immature For example, on the eve of the First and Second World Wars the masses in the imperialist countries gave in to chauvinistic propaganda. were deceived by the bourgeois politicians and did not heed the appeal of the Communist Parties to form a single front against aggression

The aggressors always strove to conceal from the working people the true aims of predatory wars, unleashed by them under some seemingly noble slogan, such as "defence of the fatherland", "faith", "allied duty", the conquest of *Lebens raum*, etc Because the masses were not conscious of their interests and their strength, the imperialists were often able to carry out their selfish plans comparatively easily As a result some unjust wars ended in the victory of the forces of reaction (the seizure by the Japanese samurais of Manchu ria and North China in 1931, the conquest of Abyssinia by Italy in 1935 1936, the seizure of power in Spain by General Franco's fascist clique with the support of the German and Italian imperialists in 1936 1939, etc)

During wars, especially world wars, the people's political consciousness developed comparatively quickly under the action of various social and military political factors, under the impact of huge losses and heavy suffering The masses learned from their experience that the war had an annexa tionist character on one or on both sides and anti war movements emerged During the Second World War this happened in many countries

When the fascist aggressors had fully revealed their intentions, their aggressive plans, the broad masses of the European countries were faced with the task of defending

their national interests, the independence of their states and the very existence of entire peoples This meant that the war against the axis states had to be waged most energetically But the reactionary ruling circles in Britain, France and the USA kept deferring decisive actions against the fascist armies, did nothing to liberate the occupied countries, and waited for nazi Germany and her allies to clash with the Soviet Union The masses were the main force in the reso lution of this contradiction

There were also some other new elements in the actions of the masses at that time They rallied round the Commu nist Parties, and the people's Resistance movement develop ed under their leadership This movement unfolded to some degree or other in all countries occupied by the fascist troops, and acquired the largest scale in France, Yugoslavia and Albania

For example, the Manifesto of the Central Committee of the French Communist Party clearly defined the historical role of the people in the struggle against the nazi invaders It said "Beaten generals, imposters, politicians with a soiled reputation will never be able to revive France It is the people on whom we lay our hope for national and social liberation And it is only around the working class, fiery and magnani mous, full of faith and daring, that the front of freedom, independence and the rebirth of France can be created [1]"

The broad national Resistance front set up in France by the Communist Party consisted of progressive workers and peasants, petty urban bourgeois and progressive intellectuals It had the support of the entire French nation By its heroic struggle the participants of the Resistance the guerillas and insurgents everywhere pinned down considerable enemy forces and dealt them powerful blows, greatly contributing to the victory over the nazis

The masses played the decisive role in making the bour geois governments of the anti Hitler coalition intensify their military operations against the common enemy The masses exerted also an enormous influence on changing the very character of the war The decisive struggle of the masses under the leadership of the Communist Parties against the nazi invaders changed the character of the war on France's

[1] Maurice Thorez, *Fils du Peuple*, Paris, 1949, p 179

part The English people understood the threat of nazi occupation long before the British Government They demanded of the government that it pursue an active anti fascist liberation war

The Italian people had to fight against annexationist wars in different conditions Between 1922 and July 1943 Italy was ruled by a fascist regime It smashed all democratic organisations The Communist Party had to work underground

The Italian fascists, headed by Mussolini, almost continuously waged aggressive wars in Africa, Spain, Greece and Albania, and later attacked the USSR together with the Hitlerites The Italian people hated these wars The defeats of the Italian troops at the front intensified the dissatisfaction of the masses with the aggressive policy of the fascist clique The struggle of the Italian people intensified under the impact of the victories scored by the Soviet Army at Orel and Kursk, and the successes of the Allies

This led to the overthrow of the Mussolini regime and the disbanding of the fascist party Italy capitulated early in September 1943 and declared war on fascist Germany Thus, the character of the war waged by Italy also changed

In unjust wars, as distinct from just ones, the class contradictions within the warring countries invariably aggravate As a result of the growth of the working people's political awareness the weapons issued to them are often turned against the external and internal class enemies in the interests of a revolutionary transformation of society This happened in Russia where the working class in alliance with the working peasantry, under the leadership of the Communist Party, for the first time in history succeeded in stopping an imperialist war waged by bourgeois landowner Russia, and in taking the power into its own hands This new role of the popular masses was manifested during the First World War also in Hungary and Germany As a result of the defeat in the war and the influence of the Great October Socialist Revolution the revolutionary movement of the masses gained considerable ground in those countries Revolution broke out in October 1918 in Hungary and in November of the same year in Germany.

The revolutionary energy of the working masses found full release also during the Second World War The peoples

of Rumania and Hungary who had been plunged by their corrupt governments into the criminal war on the side of nazi Germany, rose at the end of the war against those who forced them to support the nazis for the sake of interests alien to them The peoples of Bulgaria, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, North Korea, China, Albania and North Viet nam used their political experience and the favourable situa tion arising from the rout of the aggressors in the West and in the East, to take the power into their own hands

Thus, the role of the masses in unjust wars has not only grown, but has also acquired new quality Under definite conditions the masses can, first, demand the resignation of the government or refuse to give a vote of confidence to the party pursuing an aggressive policy, second, they can change the character of the war (being an unjust one on both sides) and transform it into a just one, directed against reactionary forces; third, the revolutionary situation shaping during the war can be used by them to carry out a socialist revolution

Role of the Masses in the Face of the Threat of a New World War

The threat of a new world war assigns historically new tasks to the masses The unleashing of such a war by the imperialists being a real prospect, the masses must take action in peacetime to cut short all aggression and to prevent it from growing into a new world war The Communists call upon the masses, upon all forces of peace, to join the struggle actively and concertedly, to exert a greater influence on the policies of the capitalist countries, and to take the issue of war and peace into their own hands

As a result of the decisive action of the masses, the main makers of history, and owing to the existence of the world socialist system, the imperialists encounter serious obstacles in their attempts to unleash and wage aggressive wars

First, in modern conditions the leading social system is the socialist, and not the capitalist Now the majority of the working masses follow the lead of the socialist system and the international working class

Second the disintegration of the colonial system has become a *fait accompli* Sovereign states develop where once there were colonies The former colonial peoples are no longer blind tools of imperialist politics True, the imperialists still have their puppets in some newly free countries, but their

position is very shaky Even there the aggressors cannot count on receiving resources during a war, as they did in the past The people who have won national independence, not to mention those who have embarked or are embarking on non capitalist development, are displaying fiery energy Naturally, they need outside help, but they increasingly turn for it to the peace loving countries and not to the forces of reaction and war

The governments of most of these states act in accordance with the will of their peoples and oppose militarism In 1964, the Cairo Conference of Non Aligned Countries condemned the use of their territories and territorial waters for military purposes Many African states are fighting to make their continent an atom free zone The Asian countries have come out against the entry of vessels carrying nuclear weapons into the Indian Ocean Almost all Asian and African states on the territories of which there are military bases of the aggressive blocs demand that the latter be dismantled

Thirdly, in the existing conditions the political awareness of the population of the capitalist countries is steadily grow ing (even though that growth differs from country to country) Internal and external events make the working masses take a greater interest in questions of domestic and foreign policy Political problems (including that of war) have stopped being the business of an elect group This can be seen from the anti war struggle of the masses in a number of European and Asian countries, and also in the USA Besides, in most capitalist countries there are strong Communist Parties, well organised peace movements, and the broad masses have already considerable experience in the struggle against im perialist aggression There can be no doubt that should a new world war break out all the peace forces will grow even more active

The rapid growth of massive political consciousness in a number of countries creates conditions making it possible to carry out a fundamental transformation of society, one blighting the roots of aggression The heroic struggle of the peoples of many countries who have overthrown imperialist rule proves Lenin's sagacious foresight He said that " . . in the impending decisive battles in the world revolution, the movement of the majority of the population of the globe, initially directed towards national liberation, will turn

against capitalism and imperialism and will, perhaps, play a more revolutionary part than we expect".[1]

The scale of the struggle against imperialist aggression has extended to the whole globe and involves millions of people, including the people in the socialist countries and those in the countries who have won national independence or are still fighting for it In the capitalist countries, too, the struggle for peace and against military adventures and aggression is growing in scale The alliance of the forces of socialism, the national liberation movement and other progressive forces is an essential prerequisite for the success of the struggle against imperialism, for social progress

Should a world nuclear war be unleashed against the will of the masses, the latter will have to decide a task of historic importance and to use different means for its implementation This task will be the destruction of the entire system of capitalism, which cannot exist without wars, just as it cannot exist without class and national oppression The fact that the above mentioned regularities will act with even greater force in the event of a nuclear war postulates as a certainty that the working people will refuse to put up any further with a system breeding wars For this purpose the Marxist Leninist Parties take constant care to strengthen the unity of all the forces of peace for the struggle against aggression and imperialism The Main Document of the International Meeting of the Communist and Workers' Parties says "The present situation demands greater militant solidarity of the peoples of socialist countries, of all contingents of the international working class movement and national liberation in the struggle against imperialism"

The military might of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and their ability to deliver crushing blows to the aggressor will play a crucial role in routing the imperialist aggressors The activity of all the peoples in the world in resolving the main task of frustrating aggression and abolishing the whole system of imperialism, will also largely depend on the military successes of the socialist camp

[1] V I Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol 32, p 482

Chapter Three

WARS IN DEFENCE OF THE SOCIALIST MOTHERLAND

Wars in defence of the socialist motherland hold a special place among the wars of our epoch. They not only differ radically from all kinds of unjust, annexationist wars, but also differ substantially from other just wars as regards their political content, specific features and historical significance

1 ARMED DEFENCE OF THE SOCIALIST MOTHERLAND A REGULARITY OF THE REVOLUTIONARY TRANSITION FROM CAPITALISM TO SOCIALISM

Marx and Engels said in their time that in the course of the socialist revolution the proletariat might have to wage liberation wars against bourgeois or pre bourgeois states, if they unleash aggression But the problem of the defence of one or several socialist countries, existing side by side with the powerful capitalist states, did not face them then They proceeded from the assumption that the proletarian revolution would triumph simultaneously in all civilised countries, that is, at least in Britain, the USA, France and Germany

In the new historical conditions that shaped in the 20th century Lenin formulated, together with the new theory of

socialist revolution, the principles of the defence of the so cialist motherland He wrote that the victory of socialism initially in one or several countries "is bound to create not only friction but a direct attempt on the part of the bour geoisie of other countries to crush the socialist state's victo rious proletariat In such cases a war on our part would be a legitimate and just war It would be a war for socialism, for the liberation of other nations from the bourgeoisie" [1]

Soon after the October Revolution Lenin developed his teaching on the defence of the socialist motherland The imperialists carried their threat of a military attack into effect and the Soviet people were compelled to take up arms in defence of their freedom and independence Lenin therefore wrote "Since October 25, 1917, we have been defencists We are for 'defence of the fatherland', but that patriotic war towards which we are moving is a war for a socialist fatherland, for socialism as a fatherland, for the Soviet republic as a *contingent* of the world army of so cialism "[2]

The teaching about the defence of the socialist mother land was further developed in the decisions of CPSU con gresses, in the documents of the International Meetings of the Representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties

The Socialist Motherland and Its Distinctive Features

A correct understanding of the specifics involved in the defence of the socialist motherland hinges on a clear idea of the concept "motherland" in general and "socialist motherland" in particular

The concept "motherland" embodies the whole history of the peoples of a given country, their age long struggle for freedom and independence, and their struggle against the forces of nature for the improvement of their living conditions, a struggle that made the motherland what it is *The motherland is a historically conditioned community of the population of a given country (one or several peoples, nations), including the given social, political and cultural environment, language, and territory, on which the people (or peoples) have been living for ages.*

The socialist motherland (the Soviet Union or other so

[1] V I Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol 23, p 79
[2] *Ibid*, Vol 27, pp 162 63

cialist countries) differs fundamentally from the bourgeois motherland *The essential feature of the socialist mother land is the new socialist system, which forms the bedrock of its social environment*

The following are the characteristic features of the social environment under socialism public ownership of the means of production, relations of co operation and fraternal assistance between all members of society, the absence of exploiter classes and of exploitation of man by man In socialist society all the means of production, all the material and spiritual wealth in the country belong to the people who have overthrown the power of the bourgeoisie The steady growth of the people's welfare is a law governing the development of socialist society.

As distinct from the bourgeois motherland, the socialist motherland knows no antagonistic contradictions and class conflicts The community of the vital interests of the workers, peasants and the intelligentsia has shaped the socio political and ideological unity of the Soviet people the source of the socialist system's indestructible strength

The socialist motherland differs radically from the bourgeois motherland as regards political environment In socialist society, power is held by the working people and the worker peasant alliance is its cornerstone

Emerging as a state of the proletarian dictatorship, the socialist state incorporated features of socialist democracy from its very inception With the triumph of socialism it becomes the political organisation of the people as a whole under the leadership of the working class The people's state is the further development of socialist statehood towards public communist self government The extending social basis of the socialist state constitutes its enormous historical strength

The socialist motherland is also characterised by the indestructible friendship of the nations incorporated in it, by relations of co operation and mutual assistance between them As a result the formerly backward nations approach the level of the advanced, and all socialist nations develop quickly and comprehensively Many formerly backward nations in the Soviet Union, mainly with the help of the Russian people, have arrived at socialism, by passing the capitalist stage of development

A distinctive feature of the spiritual make up of the so cialist nations is that they have been educated in the spirit of socialist internationalism and patriotism, of the idea of equality and fraternal friendship between all the peoples in the country, and throughout the world

Two interrelated progressive tendencies operate in social ist countries inhabited by several nations and nationalities First, every nation develops rapidly and comprehensively and all forms of socialist federation and autonomy improve steadily Second, the fraternal mutual assistance in economic and cultural development under the banner of international ism leads to a steady rapprochement between the socialist nations, to an increase in the influence they exert on each other and to their growing mutual enrichment The dialect ical interaction of these two tendencies in the socialist motherland makes for the emergence and development of a new form of social community of people an international community The Soviet people is such a new historical com munity of people of different nationalities

Socialist construction and the cultural revolution work a fundamental change in the cultural environment The so cialist system opens up unlimited prospects for the develop ment of a true people's culture, national in form and social ist in content In the socialist motherland all the achieve ments of science, technology and culture become the prop erty of the working masses, of the whole people

The building of socialism and communism is based on a deep understanding and use in the social interest of the laws of social development and the laws of nature This helps the people living under socialism to harness the forces of nature, to change the country's face consciously and according to plan

The masses closely link the concept "socialist motherland" with the leading role of the Marxist Leninist Party, without which the outstanding material and cultural advance, and the victories in the wars against imperialist aggressors would have been impossible

The distinctive features of the socialist motherland are reflected in socialist patriotism, which is a patriotism of a new, higher type To the best traditions inherited by it from the past it has added a feeling of pride for the people's revolutionary gains and the unprecedented flourishing of

the country, and the awareness of the superiority of social ism over capitalism

Socialist patriotism organically combines three inter linked aspects 1 a deep *feeling* of love for one's country and people, for the best national traditions and the heroic past of the motherland, hatred for its enemies, a feeling of na tional pride, 2 *the idea of serving the motherland,* an un derstanding of one's patriotic duty; 3 *patriotic action,* that is, practical services to the motherland in heroic exploits on the field of battle, in the revolutionary struggle against oppressors and in honest labour

Socialist patriotism is indissolubly linked with proletari an internationalism With the emergence of the world so cialist system the patriotism of the members of socialist society is embodied in their devotion and loyalty to their own country and to the entire community of socialist coun tries Socialist patriotism and socialist internationalism or ganically incorporate proletarian solidarity with the work ing class and the working people of all countries

Communist construction in the USSR is part of the build ing of communist society by the peoples of the entire world socialist system The development of countries in the single socialist system makes it possible to accelerate the building of socialism and communism.

The fraternal unity and co operation of the socialist coun tries, based on the principles of Marxism Leninism and proletarian internationalism, falls in with the supreme na tional interests of every one of them and at the same time with the interests of all the countries in the socialist com munity. The International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties held in Moscow in June 1969 noted that the development and consolidation of every single socialist country are an important condition for the advance of the entire world socialist system, that the comprehensive co operation between them falls in both with the national in terests of the people of each country and the common in terests of the socialist cause, that it promotes the further successes in the decisive fields of the economic competition between the two systems

Isolation from the socialist camp fetters the development of a country towards socialism, deprives it of the possibility to avail itself of the advantages offered by the world so

cialist system, encourages the attempts of the imperialist powers to use nationalistic trends to their ends The Communist and Workers' parties, therefore, wage an irreconcilable struggle against nationalism and all vestiges of national narrow mindedness They consider it their prime duty to educate the working people in the spirit of socialist internationalism and patriotism, to instil in them a deep understanding of the fact that the national and international interests of the socialist countries are inseparable and identical

Socialist patriotism and internationalism gain an ever stronger hold on the minds and hearts of the people In their unity they have become the standard of behaviour of the builders of the new society, inspiring them for heroic exploits in labour and in the armed defence of their socialist motherland

The Threat of Military Attacks by Imperialists and Necessity for the Armed Defence of the Socialist Motherland

The building of socialism and communism in the USSR and other countries has acquired an international character The successes in the building of socialism and communism inspire the working class, the working masses in the capitalist countries to revolutionary struggle, and the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries to the national liberation struggle But this raises fears with the imperialist bourgeoisie for the fate of capitalism, for their economic and political privileges, fans up their hatred for the working people of the socialist countries and feeds their desire to unleash wars against them "More than any other, our revolution," Lenin said, "has proved the rule that the strength of a revolution, the vigour of its assault, its energy, determination, its victory and its triumph intensify the resistance of the bourgeoisie The more victorious we are the more the capitalist exploiters learn to unite and the more determined their onslaught [1]

This law operates in countries that have embarked on socialist development till the power of the bourgeoisie is broken, till the exploiter classes are done away with, and disappears with the triumph of socialism

In the international arena the law of class struggle will

[1] V I Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol 30, p 450

cease to operate when the imperialist camp stops to exist. The sphere of its operation contracts as a result of the expansion and consolidation of the world socialist system.

The ideologists of anti-communism often express their fear and desperation in the face of the enormous successes of the socialist countries in the building of the new society. Thus, W. J. Schlamm, the former editor of *Fortune* magazine, in his book *The Limits of the Wonder*, saw the "monstrous essence of the conflict" in the fact that communism wants peace and to flourish in conditions of peace. In this connection Schlamm wants the ruling circles of the USA and other countries of the imperialist camp to confront the Soviet Union with the alternative: atomic war or a rejection of the gains of socialism.[1]

The main aim the imperialists pursue in unleashing aggressive wars against the socialist countries is their striving to overthrow the most progressive social system in the world by force of arms, to restore the power of the capitalists and landowners. At the same time they also pursue other aims, such as depriving the peoples of the socialist countries of their national independence and state sovereignty, looting their national wealth, dismembering the territory that is historically theirs, and transforming large parts of it into colonial possessions or "spheres of influence" of the imperialist powers, destroying the populations of those countries, and suppressing the revolutionary working-class movements in their own countries. The imperialists do not restrain their aggressive aspirations towards non-socialist countries, do not give up their colonial and neo-colonial policies towards the newly-independent states.

The predatory and counter-revolutionary aims pursued by the imperialists in their wars against the socialist countries found the most cynical expression in the plans of the Hitlerites for the attack against the Soviet Union, the statements made by the nazi leaders, and the manner in which the German fascist aggressors waged the annexationist war against the Soviet Union.

The German imperialists sought to destroy the Soviet state, to abolish the gains of socialism, the national inde-

---

[1] W. J. Schlamm, *Die Grenzen des Wunders. Ein Bericht über Deutschland*, Zürich, 1959, S. 185.

pendence and culture of the Soviet peoples, to make them slaves of German capitalists and landowners. They wanted to dismember the Soviet Union, to tear from it and incorporate into Germany or transform into their colonies the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, the Crimea, the Caucasus, and the Volga region The plan for the attack on the USSR, the notorious "Barbarossa" plan, and the supplementary directives and instructions to the plan (Goring's "Green Folder", and others) contained a monstrous programme for the destruction of the Soviet Union's wealth They planned to lay waste a large part of Soviet industry, to cart away all machinery and equipment to Germany, to drive millions of people to Germany for forced labour, and physically to destroy many millions of people

At one of his conferences with the commanders of his armies Hitler said "It is not enough for us simply to smash the Russian army and to seize Leningrad, Moscow and the Caucasus We must wipe the country from the face of the earth and destroy its people"

Before the offensive against Moscow the troops of the Army Group Centre received the following order from Hitler: "The city must be surrounded so that not a single Russian soldier, not a single Russian inhabitant, man, woman or child, should be able to leave it Any attempt at departure should be suppressed by force Requisite measures should be taken to provide huge structures that will submerge Moscow and its environs An enormous sea shall form where Moscow stands today and hide the capital of the Russian people from the civilised world forever"[1]

The nazi savages destroyed millions of Soviet people, drove hundreds of thousands of young men and women to their empire and enslaved them The nazi monsters treated government and Party workers, Communists and non party activists with special cruelty They attempted to fulfil the task the nazi ringleaders had set them to destroy all traces of the Soviet socialist system and of communist ideology

As regards the basic aims of such war, and the means and methods for their achievement, the nazis were no exception among the imperialist aggressors This is clearly revealed

[1] *Offiziere gegen Hitler*, nach einem Erlebnisbericht von Fabian v Schlabrendorf, Zurich, 1946, S 48

by the many facts and documents showing the true intentions of the imperialists towards the German Democratic Republic, the Korean People's Democratic Republic, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, and also by their plans for military attacks on other socialist countries

Imperialists are still hatching crazy plans of "liberating" the European socialist countries The misanthropic character of these plans was revealed by the would be "liberators" themselves Some US military leaders advocate the "scorched earth", "dead desert" strategy They openly discuss the question of the most effective ways of destroying the population of the socialist countries, whether this should be done by annihilating cities with nuclear weapons or whether bacteriological and chemical weapons should be used Some US generals and senators consider the latter more profitable because it will help to preserve and seize the material values belonging to the peoples, whom these modern vandals intend to exterminate At present the imperialists of the USA and other countries mask their aggressive aims with phrases about the "free world", struggle for "democracy", etc The political and military leaders of the imperialist states energetically spread their inventions about the "communist danger", "Red imperialism", "export of the revolution", and so on In an attempt to justify such lies they misinterpret the Marxist Leninist teaching and distort the policies of the Soviet Union and other socialist states

The foreign policy of the socialist countries, which is aimed at ensuring peaceful conditions for the building of the new society, gives the lie to these malicious inventions of the imperialist ideologists Frederick Engels said in his time " the victorious proletariat can force no blessings of any kind upon any foreign nation without undermining its own victory by so doing Which of course by no means excludes defensive wars of various kinds ..."[1]

Capitalism established its domination by the sword, but socialism does not need wars to spread its ideals Its most powerful weapon is its supremacy over the old system in social organisation, in the economy, in raising the people's living standard, and in ensuring the flourishing of culture

[1] K Marx and F Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Moscow, 1965, p 351

The economic might and growing international influence of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries serves the cause of peace and co operation between the peoples and has a growing impact on international relations Socialism has outstripped capitalism in a number of key branches of science and technology and has given the peace loving peo ples powerful material means for checking imperialist ag gression The further strengthening of the economic might and defence potential of the socialist system is an impor tant means of ensuring the armed defence and security of the socialist countries

Even though the imperialist schemes to weaken the so cialist camp and to destroy it in a nuclear war are unrea lisable, this does not remove the danger of war, of a sudden attack by the aggressors on the socialist countries At times this danger grows very acute

Thus, *the need to defend the socialist gains against all attacks by international imperialist reaction, the armed de fence of the socialist countries, is one of the general laws of the transition from capitalism to socialism and commu nism, one applying to all countries making this transition while the world imperialist system and the constant threat of military attacks by the imperialists against the socialist countries continue to exist*

2 POLITICAL CONTENT AND SPECIFIC FEATURES OF WAR IN DEFENCE OF THE SOCIALIST MOTHERLAND

War in defence of the socialist motherland is a special kind of war that differs essentially from other just wars as regards its origin, aims and character, and also as re gards the attitude to it of the popular masses

Unconditional Justness of Wars in Defence of the Socialist Motherland

Such wars are unconditionally just They are waged for the sake of revo lutionary and liberation aims no ex ploiter state ever pursued or is able to pursue

The main aims the socialist states pursue in wars imposed on them by the imperialist aggres sors are the following

first, defence of socialism, the most just social system in history,

second, defence of the freedom and independence of the socialist nations, their territory, culture and their very existence,

third, assistance to other socialist states in rebuffing aggression,

fourth, assistance to the working class, the working masses of the capitalist countries, the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries, and to the young national states in their liberation struggle against imperialist oppression and foreign enslavement

These aims are directly opposed to the predatory aims pursued by the exploiter classes in unjust, annexationist wars, and in the imperialist counter revolutionary wars against the socialist countries They also differ fundamentally from the aims of the just, liberation wars waged by bourgeois states Wars in defence of the socialist motherland continue the politics of the proletarian revolution In a concrete explanation of the Marxist principle on the political essence of war as applying to the defence of the socialist motherland, Lenin wrote *"Our war is the continuation of the politics of revolution,* the politics of overthrowing the exploiters, capitalists and landowners"[1]

As distinct from the liberation wars waged by the exploiter classes, a patriotic war of a socialist state can never be transformed into an annexationist, unjust war In defending its just and noble aims, a socialist country never strikes a deal with imperialist aggressors to the detriment of the interests of other peoples Conversely, wars between exploiter states often end in a deal between the ruling circles of the warring countries and the betrayal of the interests of their peoples Moreover, when the working masses rise in revolution against the existing system, the exploiter classes of the belligerent states often stop the war and unite to suppress the revolution

The staunch resolve of the people of a socialist country to stand all the trials of modern war is a guarantee of their victory over the aggressor The experience of the two patriotic wars of the Soviet state has proved this beyond doubt

[1] V I Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol 30, p 224

Hence, *the justness of the aims and tasks of the armed defence of the socialist motherland and the people's unshakeable conviction that it is really just, are a decisive condition for their victory in the patriotic war*

Revolutionary Character of Wars in Defence of Socialism

Wars in defence of the socialist motherland have a consistently revolutionary character This specific feature is expressed in the class content of the wars waged by socialist states, in the main aims these states pursue in wars, and in the results of these wars

As regards their class content wars in defence of the socialist motherland are a continuation of the class struggle of the proletariat and its allies against the international imperialist bourgeoisie and all reactionary forces of the old society

Lenin wrote that the war of a socialist state against imperialist intervention has the character of an international civil war

A civil war in an individual socialist country often combines with armed struggle against foreign imperialists, as was the case in Russia in 1918 1920 The war in Korea between 1950 and 1953 also combined the national liberation war against the US interventionists and the civil war against the counter revolutionary forces of the Korean landowners and the bourgeoisie

Wars in defence of the socialist motherland have a revolutionary class character even if they are not attended by civil war As regards its content the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union (1941 1945) was not only a national liberation, anti fascist war, but also an irreconcilable struggle against the most reactionary forces of international imperialism at that time It was marked by features of an international civil war, since it decided the fate of socialism not only in the USSR but also in the whole world

The revolutionary, liberation character of wars in defence of the socialist motherland is expressed also in the fact that their victorious outcome weakens the positions of international imperialism, and in certain conditions also results in the defeat of reactionary regimes in the aggressor countries, promotes the victory in those countries of the

forces of democracy and socialism, and the falling away of new countries from the world capitalist system This is a regularity of armed clashes between socialist and imperial ist states.

This regularity will apply in full measure in a future world war, should the imperialists unleash it Socialism will win this war, even though the peoples of the socialist countries, the working masses of the world and the Marxist Leninist Parties, heading their liberation struggle, are not in the least interested in bringing about the downfall of capitalism and the victory of socialism by means of war

The revolutionary character of the war in defence of the socialist motherland has given rise to the revolutionary methods by which such wars are waged Engels was the first to tackle and to resolve in principle the problem of the use of the revolutionary method in wars conducted by the victorious proletariat He described it in his article "Pos sibilities and Prospects of the War of the Holy Alliance Against France in 1852". However, this method could be elaborated only in practice, that is, in the course of wars in defence of the socialist motherland It has been worked out by the Communist Party and the Soviet people in the grim battles against imperialism

The revolutionary method in the conduct of war is char acterised by the decisive political and military aims of the socialist state in the war, by its firm line aimed at the com plete rout of the enemy, by the extremely energetic actions of the armed forces, by the offensive spirit and the selfless ness and mass heroism of the soldiers, it demands a total mobilisation of all the forces in the country, in the rear and at the front, the monolithic unity of the army and the people, and leadership of the war by the Communist Party

This method has stood the acid test of the two wars in defence of the socialist motherland and is being developed and improved in modern conditions

Wars in Defence of the Socialist Motherland Are People's Wars

The most important feature of wars in defence of the socialist motherland is that they are genuinely people's wars in all respects as regards their aims and historical significance, the attitude of the masses towards them, and the methods by which they are fought

Owing to the just aims and tasks of such a war, which fully correspond to the working people's interests, the masses take an active part in it, support and implement the policy of the Marxist Leninist Party and the government and rally even more closely round them The force of cohesion, Lenin said, grows in the measure that the danger to the socialist gains of the working people and the country's freedom increases, the difficulties of the liberation war strengthen the resolve of the masses to rout the enemy The unity of the people, Party and government of the socialist state during the war is a concrete expression of the socio political and moral unity of society, of the invincible friendship of the socialist nations

Only in a socialist state do all the people, all classes and social groups participate in the war, deeply understand its aims and tasks, the need to give all their powers and, if necessary, their lives for the freedom of the motherland The unprecedented energy and high level of consciousness of the masses, their heroism and self sacrifice in the armed defence of their motherland are conditioned by the nature of the socialist system, by the law of the growth, in depth and scale, of the conscious participation of the masses in historic transformations The increase in the number and activity of the working masses, who are consciously strengthening the country's defensive capacity and fighting patriotic wars, is an important regularity of the armed defence of the socialist motherland

Thus, the Soviet people's war against the foreign interventionists and whiteguard counter revolutionaries was at first fought mainly by the workers and most conscious poor peasants, later, however, as they grew convinced of the just character of the war on the side of the Soviet Republic and of the anti popular aims of the whiteguards and interventionists, broad layers of poor and middle peasants joined in the struggle "We succeeded in rousing unprecedented numbers of people to display an intelligent attitude towards the war, and to support it actively," Lenin said "Never before, under any political regime, has there been even one tenth of the sympathy with a war and an understanding of it as that unanimously displayed by our Party and non Party workers and non Party peasants (and the mass of the peasants are non Party) under Soviet power

That is the main reason for our having ultimately defeated a powerful enemy "[1]

As a result of the sweeping socio economic transformations, the abolition of the exploiter classes and the growth of the political awareness of the masses in the course of socialist construction, ever broader layers of working people begin to participate actively in strengthening the defence potential of the country, and become willing staunchly to defend their fatherland With the triumph of socialism all people become firm and conscious defenders of the socialist country This was clearly demonstrated in the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union

When the nazis treacherously attacked the Soviet Union in 1941 they expected that the first strikes of their troops and the serious setbacks of the Soviet Army would produce conflicts and clashes within the Soviet Union, that the worker peasant alliance and the friendship of the peoples building socialism would break up They hoped in vain The people led by the Communist Party showed a unity and cohesion unprecedented in history They performed heroic exploits at the front and in the rear, and the fame of their heroism spread far and wide

The victory of the Soviet people in that war confirmed that there is no force in the world able to stop the progressive development of socialist society

The just liberation war of the Vietnamese people against the US aggressors and their accomplices is also a true people's war

Thus, the active and conscious participation of the entire nation in a patriotic war against imperialist aggression is one of the decisive causes of the victorious outcome of that war

Internationalist Character of Wars in Defence of the Socialist Motherland

Wars in defence of the socialist motherland combine the national and international aims and tasks of the proletariat's liberation struggle In defending the vital interests of the working class and of all the working people and the national interests of the given country, the socialist state at the same time discharges its liberation mission and its international

[1] V. I Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol 31, p 498

ist duty towards the working class and all the working people in the capitalist and colonial countries This found a particularly clear expression in the wars of the Soviet state By defending the gains of socialism in their own country, the Soviet people and their armed forces at the same time helped to liberate other peoples from imperialist oppression

The victory of a socialist state in war inspires the working people of the capitalist countries in the struggle against the endeavours of the imperialist bourgeoisie to smash the revolutionary working class movement, to abolish all the democratic gains of the working people, and to establish a terroristic dictatorship of finance capital. Lenin said that the workers of all countries pinned their hope on Soviet Russia and drew strength from her victories over the imperialists Therefore, by displaying mass heroism in defence of the socialist motherland, the peoples of the USSR perform an important international mission, helping the working class and all the working people in their liberation struggle "To day, in fighting for a socialist system in Russia, we are fighting for socialism all over the world,"[1] Lenin wrote

The Soviet Union has always given moral and political support to the oppressed peoples in their struggle for liberation But this was not the only support they received. By routing the armed forces of the imperialists in 1918 1920 and the nazi armies in the Great Patriotic War, the Soviet Union rendered important military support to the oppressed peoples of several countries in their struggle against foreign oppressors.

At the request of her revolutionary government the Mongolian Republic received direct military aid in the armed struggle against the whiteguard bands of generals Ungern and Semyonov (1921), and against the Japanese militarists, who invaded Mongolia in the summer of 1939 in the region of Lake Buir Nur and the Khalkhin Gol river

During the Second World War too the USSR fulfilled its liberation mission with honour; it played the decisive role in delivering the European peoples from foreign oppression and nazi tyranny and helped the Korean and Chinese peoples expel the Japanese invaders The victory of the So

[1] V. I Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol 28, p 82

viet Union in the Great Patriotic War enabled the Asian and African peoples to expand the struggle against colonialism for the liberation of their countries

The peoples of Central and Southeast Europe and of some Asian countries whom the Soviet Union helped to deliver from foreign invaders were able to take up the building of a new socialist life

In the final stage of the Great Patriotic War and in the post war years, the Soviet Union prevented armed intervention by the imperialists in the People's Democracies

In their turn the international proletariat, the working people in the capitalist and colonial countries give fraternal assistance to a socialist state in its just war This is explained, first, by the community of vital interests of the proletariat, the exploited and oppressed masses of the whole world and the peoples in the socialist countries in the struggle against imperialism, second, by the great interest all working people show in preserving and consolidating the socialist countries, their bulwark in the struggle for the establishment of socialism in their own countries and their reliable shield against military attacks by world imperialist reaction; third, by the international, liberation aims and the historic significance of wars in defence of the socialist motherland

As early as September 1917 Lenin predicted that if the power in Russia passed into the hands of the Soviets and if Russia's imperialist opponents and "allies" refused to make peace, the war would transform into a just, liberation war and "under such conditions it would, as far as we are concerned, be a war in league with the oppressed classes of all countries, a war in league with the oppressed peoples of the whole world, not in word, but in deed"[1]

The working class and the people of the capitalist and colonial countries support and assist their brothers in the most varied forms and by diverse means by political actions demanding that an end be put to the aggression against the socialist countries, by sabotaging military production and preventing the delivery of war materials to the aggressors, by armed guerilla struggle against the invaders or by fighting in the ranks of the armies of the socialist

[1] V I Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol 26, p 63

countries, by giving diverse moral and political support to the peoples of the socialist countries, etc

During the Civil War and the foreign military intervention the workers of all countries advanced the slogan "Hands Off Soviet Russia!", set up action committees (in Britain), organised strikes and demonstrations in protest against the intervention, and refused to load arms and materiels for the interventionists and whiteguards They exerted enormous pressure on the ruling circles of their countries and this became one of the reasons for the end to the intervention

The international proletariat gave the Soviet state not only moral and political but also direct military assistance The Red Army incorporated international brigades and regiments formed of workers and peasants, and nationals of many European and Asian countries

The mutual support of the peoples of the Soviet Union and the working masses of the capitalist countries assumed a particularly sweeping scale in the war against the fascist aggressors The USSR fought the Great Patriotic War against the fascist aggressors in alliance with the international proletariat and the freedom loving peoples

Despite all the plots hatched by the reactionaries, including those in the ruling circles, the workers, peasants, progressive intellectuals, and soldiers of the capitalist countries in the anti Hitler coalition actively helped the Soviet Union, which fulfilled with honour its allied commitments, and its liberating mission to free the people enslaved by the nazi invaders

The armed military units which the Polish, Czechoslovak and Rumanian patriots set up in the Soviet Union with the fraternal assistance of the Soviet state and people fought side by side with the Soviet Armed Forces for the liberation of Soviet territory and their countries from the invaders The peoples of China, Korea, Indochina and other Asian countries fought shoulder to shoulder with the Soviet people in the liberation war against the Japanese imperialists and their puppets

After the nazi attack of the Soviet Union the people in the European countries enslaved by the German and Italian invaders developed, under the leadership of the Communist Parties, a sweeping resistance movement and gue

rilla war against the enemy. This struggle assumed a particularly wide scale in Bulgaria, Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, France, Italy and other countries The guerilla detachments in the occupied countries contributed greatly to the common cause of routing the fascist coalition

The imperialists admit that they are afraid of a people's guerilla movement in a future war That is why the general staffs of the imperialist powers and the leaders of the military blocs are actively preparing for anti guerilla warfare

The steady increase in the number of working people in the capitalist and colonial countries, who actively support and assist the peoples of the socialist countries in the war against imperialist aggressors, is an important regularity promoting the armed defence of the socialist countries

3. DEFENCE OF THE GAINS OF SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM BY THE STATES OF THE SOCIALIST COMMUNITY

The armed defence of the gains of socialism and communism against military attacks by imperialist aggressors is one of the most important functions of the socialist state It includes direct armed struggle by the army and the people against aggressors, and the defence of the borders of socialist states, of their territory, their air and sea space. The foreign policy of the socialist state and its domestic social and economic policy also serve to protect the socialist country

Historico Conditioned Nature of the Defence of the Socialist Motherland

Since it first emerged the function of the defence of the socialist country has changed considerably due to the transformation of the socio economic basis in the country, the changes in the international situation and in the relation of the socio political forces in the world Fundamentally new aspects have emerged in the defence of the socialist country in connection with the formation of the world socialist system

In the first years of the existence of the Soviet state its function of defence of the socialist country against military attacks fused with that of suppressing the armed resistance of the overthrown exploiters, who had allied themselves

with the foreign interventionists Other socialist countries are also resolving this task in the transition period from capitalism to socialism with the help of the fraternal coun tries

In the period between the two patriotic wars the armed defence of the socialist country took the form of the defence of its frontiers against military provocations by the capital ist states, the struggle against armed bands, spies and wreckers infiltrating across the borders, the prevention and suppression of attempts by domestic counter revolutionary forces to organise insurrections, unleash a new civil war and thereby to clear the road for a new military interven tion by the imperialists

The armed defence also included the task of stopping international imperialist reaction from unleashing war against the socialist countries, and where this was impos sible, at least of delaying it. The Soviet state pursued a principled flexible foreign policy to achieve that purpose This policy was promoted by the Soviet Union's economic successes, which helped to strengthen its defence potential and the military might of its armed forces

During the Great Patriotic War the entire activity of the Soviet people served the armed defence of the socialist country which was transformed into a single military camp. Under these conditions the fate of the socialist country de pended primarily on the solution of the military question

The function of defence underwent changes in the post war years, when the Soviet state became a state of the whole people in which the leading role belongs to the work ing class This found expression in a substantial extension of the state's social basis, in the strengthening of the polit ical and ideological unity of society and, hence, in the growth of the country's defensive might

An unprecedented upsurge of the forces of peace, democ racy and socialism in the world set in after the war The world socialist system formed and consolidated on a fun damentally different basis than the capitalist system, for the socialist system is a social, economic and political com munity of free peoples united by close links of internation al socialist solidarity, by their identical interests and aims, and by their identical Marxist Leninist principles

The entry of the world socialist system into a new stage

of development and the further change in the relation of forces in the world have created new and more favourable conditions and possibilities for the armed defence of the socialist countries

Before the Second World War the economic and military potential of all capitalist countries taken together exceeded that of the USSR The world capitalist system accounted for five sixths of the world territory and over 90 per cent of the world population It included vast territories inhabited by 1,500 million people in the colonial and dependent countries, which formed a reserve of imperialism The volume of the industrial output of the bourgeois countries exceeded that of the Soviet Union several fold The Soviet Union was the only socialist country in the world and was opposed by the imperialist camp, which was strong even though it was rent by internal antagonisms The imperialist powers bent every effort to isolate the Soviet Union politically.

It was in such a position that the Soviet Union found itself on the eve of the Second World War On the West, South and East it was faced by hostile states There was a constant threat of armed intervention by the united forces of imperialism and the danger of a restoration of the capitalist system by force

Now the situation has changed The imperialist camp is confronted by a powerful socialist system, which is commanding enormous resources Owing to the advantages of its economic and political system, the socialist community can use the resources needed to satisfy its defence needs according to plan, that is, much more effectively than the capitalist states

The victory of the Soviet Union in the Great Patriotic War helped the peoples in the colonies and dependent countries rise in the struggle for national and social liberation This led to the collapse of the colonial system The sphere of the imperialist rule has contracted considerably Imperialism is no longer able to use the human and material resources of many Asian and some African countries for its war aims

The situation in the countries bordering on the Soviet Union has also changed Formerly all of them were part of the imperialist camp, whereas now most of the countries

bordering on the Soviet Union are either socialist or friendly non socialist countries All this means that the capitalist encirclement of the Soviet Union no longer exists

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, taking full account of the relation of forces between the two opposing systems, has drawn the scientific conclusion that socialism has won in the Soviet Union completely and irrevocably This means that the possibility of a restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union is excluded "The combined forces of the socialist camp are a sure guarantee for each socialist country," the Programme of the CPSU reads, "against encroachments by imperialist reaction The consolidation of the socialist countries in a single camp, its increasing unity and steadily growing strength, ensures the complete victory of socialism and communism within the framework of the system as a whole "[1]

Defence of the Socialist Countries in Modern Conditions

In modern conditions the defence of the gains of socialism and communism depends largely on the ability of the socialist states to join their efforts in the face of the danger of imperialist aggression. on their ability to preserve and multiply these gains in the course of the economic competition with the capitalist system Peace between peoples creates favourable conditions for the building of socialism and communism This is an objective law

Proceeding from this law. the Soviet Union and other socialist states spare no effort to create favourable international conditions for the building of socialism and communism With this end in view they pursue a co ordinated foreign policy and do all they can to strengthen the unity and cohesion of the socialist countries, their friendship and brotherhood, to support national liberation movements and co operate in every way with the young developing states, to consistently uphold the principle of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems, to decisively rebuff the aggressive forces of imperialism, and to save mankind from a new world war.

The economic growth and consolidation of the socialist system, the constant increase in the material welfare and

[1] *The Road to Communism*, Moscow, 1962, p 465

culture of the peoples in the socialist countries are the principal and most effective form of influencing the historical process "We are now exercising our main influence on the international revolution through our economic policy," Lenin wrote " The struggle in this field has now become global Once we solve this problem, we shall have certainly and finally won on an international scale That is why for us questions of economic development become of absolutely exceptional importance."[1]

History is on the side of socialism The socialist countries advance confidently towards victory over capitalism Their successes in the peaceful competition with capitalism rest on a solid basis It consists in the fundamentally different way in which social laws operate under socialism, in the much more perfect economic organisation of society. Let us but consider just two important factors First, there is the mutual assistance and support of the socialist countries, which, in addition to the new type of international division of labour, enables each country to use its resources and its productive forces to the full and in the most rational way Second, the socialist countries develop economically at a higher rate than capitalist countries Stable high economic development rates are one of socialism's decisive achievements and advantages Between 1929 and 1966 the average yearly increase in industrial output was 11 1 per cent in the USSR, 4 per cent in the USA, 2 5 per cent in Britain and France The socialist countries produced in 1966 about ten times more than had been produced on the same territory in 1937, while the industrial output of capitalist countries increased during that period only 3 6 fold

However, the imperialist countries rely in their struggle against socialism not only on their economic might and their moral and political possibilities They also use their military potential in full measure Hence, the change in the relation of forces in favour of peace and socialism is connected also with the growth of the defensive might of the Soviet Union and other socialist states To create normal conditions as regards international policies for socialist and communist construction, they strengthen their military potential and improve their military organisation

[1] V I Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol 32, p 437

The wish of the peoples and states of the socialist com munity to prevent aggression against the socialist countries by means of concerted action led to the conclusion in May 1955 of the Warsaw Treaty of Friendship, Co operation and Mutual Assistance Between the European Socialist Coun tries

This defensive alliance is based on the community of the interests and aims of the socialist countries The defence of the socialist gains and of the peaceful labour of the peo ples, of their national freedom and state sovereignty, and the consolidation of world peace such are the noble aims of that alliance

The Warsaw Treaty was signed as a counter measure to the setting up of the imperialist aggressive NATO bloc It provides for consultations among its participants in the event that one or several socialist states are threatened with attack, and for adopting concerted measures to safeguard peace and to rebuff aggression It stipulates that the signa tories to the Treaty will also take other co ordinated mea sures to strengthen their defence potential in order to pro tect the peaceful labour of their peoples, to guarantee the inviolability of their borders and territories and to ensure the defence against possible aggression A Unified Military Command of the Armed Forces of the member states has been set up in accordance with the Treaty

The signing of the Warsaw defence treaty has consider ably extended the possibility of co ordinating the efforts the socialist countries are taking to rebuff aggressors, of carrying out co ordinated political, economic and military measures if the imperialists unleash a war against any member of the Warsaw Treaty.

The defensive alliance of the European socialist coun tries has demonstrated its viability The member states are ready jointly to defend the socialist countries against im perialist aggression The Sofia Meeting of the Political Con sultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member states held in March 1968 adopted a Declaration which reaffirmed that they would give full support and every assistance to the Vietnamese people in their fight against imperialist ag gression. At Dresden and other meetings the leaders of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries unanimously confirmed their decision to take concrete mea

sures in order to strengthen the Warsaw Treaty and its Armed Forces

In addition to the Warsaw Treaty bilateral treaties on friendship, co operation and mutual assistance in ensuring security and defence against possible aggression by the imperialists were signed between the Soviet Union and other socialist countries Recently these contractual relations have grown stronger and been further developed The Soviet Czechoslovak treaty has been extended for another twenty years New treaties have been signed by the Soviet Union with Poland, Mongolia, Bulgaria and Hungary Treaties of friendship have been signed between other socialist countries as well

The socialist countries consider it their common duty to strengthen the defence potential of the community For historical reasons, however, the main burden in this has fallen on the shoulders of the Soviet people Defence incurs heavy expenditure, but the Soviet people understand that this spending is unavoidable Being economically and militarily the strongest power, the Soviet Union places its military might, including its nuclear missile capacity, at the service of collective security, constantly gives considerable help to the fraternal armies and does everything to strengthen the comradeship in arms with other socialist states

The growth of the economic, political and military might of the USSR and other socialist countries has extended the possibility of defending general democratic and socialist revolutions in new countries, of cutting short all attempts to export counter revolution to those countries "*The Communist Parties, which guide themselves by the Marxist Leninist doctrine, have always been against the export of revolution At the same time they fight resolutely against imperialist export of counter revolution They consider it their internationalist duty to call on the peoples of all countries to unite, to rally all their internal forces, to act vigorously and, relying on the might of the world socialist system, to prevent or firmly resist imperialist interference in the affairs of any people who have risen in revolution,*"[1] says the Statement of the Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties held in 1960.

[1] *The Struggle for Peace, Democracy and Socialism*, Moscow, 1961, p 73

The Soviet people have always fulfilled their internation alist duty to the working people rising in revolution against domestic and foreign oppressors On the eve of the Second World War the Soviet Union assisted the working people of Spain and other countries in which national liberation wars, general democratic and socialist revolutions had taken place The Soviet Union acted decisively to protect the rev olutionary gains of the Cuban people against the US im perialists, who intended to launch a military intervention against Cuba in October 1962 The plans of the imperialists to strangle the Cuban revolution were foiled by the firm stand of Cuba's revolutionary government, the resolute sol idarity of the Cuban people, the military assistance by the Soviet Union and the political and moral support by other socialist countries, by all the peace loving peoples

The defence of the socialist countries is now indissoluble from the granting of comprehensive assistance to the na tional liberation movement of the peoples oppressed by imperialism, and also to the national states which emerged as a result of their liberation from colonial oppression.

As distinct from bourgeois states, socialist states estab lish relations with other countries on the principles of equal ity and mutually advantageous economic co operation, and grant assistance to newly free countries on privileged terms A case in point is the help given by the Soviet Union to India in the building of iron and steel works and engineer ing plants, and also the assistance rendered to the ARE in the building of the Aswan High Dam, the diverse assis tance to other young national states in creating and devel oping their economy

The socialist countries are now playing a much more im portant role in ensuring world peace Today more than ever before, the security of the socialist countries is insepar able from the task of preserving universal peace The So viet Union and other socialist countries therefore pursue an active foreign policy directed at eliminating hotbeds of military conflict and at cutting short imperialist aggressive actions in every corner of the world These countries use their economic, political and military potentials to strength en peace and friendship between peoples "The revolu tionary gains of our people, and those of others," the 23rd Congress of the CPSU noted, "would be in jeopardy if they

were not shielded, directly or indirectly, by the immense military strength of the countries of the socialist community and above all that of the Soviet Union If at times the imperialists are apprehensive of doing what they would like, they are restrained solely by the knowledge of the risk this entails for them "[1]

Thus, by defending the peaceful construction of socialism and communism, and by ensuring the security of the socialist countries, the Soviet socialist state, together with other socialist countries, defends the peace and security of all peoples

While there is an aggressive imperialist camp, the Soviet state and other socialist countries must strengthen their defence capacity, maintain the battleworthiness of their armed forces at the highest level.

The International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties held in 1969 reaffirmed that the socialist system is the bulwark of the world anti imperialist, revolutionary movement and that the defence of the socialist gains is the internationalist duty of Communists of all countries

4 ROLE OF THE MARXIST LENINIST PARTY IN THE ARMED DEFENCE OF THE SOCIALIST MOTHERLAND

The defence of the socialist motherland is a general regularity of the building of socialism and communism in the contemporary epoch It is not achieved automatically, but is a result of the conscious and purposeful activity of the builders of the new society under the leadership of the Marxist Leninist Party *The Party is the inspirer and organiser of the defence of the socialist country*

Leadership by the CPSU of the Defence of Socialism

Anti communists and all critics of the socialist system picture the leadership by the Party of all aspects of the activity of socialist society, including also of military development, of the army, as an anomaly, as a "deformation" of socialism, as a negative phenomenon Moreover, all moral sins are ascribed to the leading party

[1] *23rd Congress of the CPSU*, Moscow, 1966, p 267

However, the arguments of these critics, which are based only on their sentiments, contradict science and historical experience

In all socialist countries the Marxist Leninist Parties act as the leading and guiding force that ensures the successful development of the states and the peoples Historical experience demonstrates that where the Party loses control over social processes even for a short time, the country's development is inevitably confronted with a more or less serious crisis

The need for Party leadership of socialist construction and of the defence of the socialist country is inherent in the nature of socialism, and is an economic, political and ideological requirement of the new society

In the economic field socialism emerges not spontaneously, as do the formations based on private ownership, but is built consciously and according to plan under the leadership of the Marxist Leninist Party by the efforts of the working class and the masses supporting it It is the first society in history in which the guidance of social processes is both necessary and possible New laws become operative and old economic laws stop to rule blindly over people and to make social development utterly spontaneous This major advantage of socialism obliges the members of socialist society to be deeply conscious of their duties and to participate actively and in an organised way in the building of the new society The laws of socialism are such that they promote socialism only if they are correctly understood and applied in social management, and if the working people are organised for their execution These conditions can be secured only by Party leadership.

In the political system of socialist society the Party is the highest form of class organisation first of the proletariat and, after the complete victory of socialism, of the whole people This corresponds to the nature of the working class, to its vital interests and aims Only the Party is able to carry out the political leadership of the proletariat, and through it of all the working people Without it there could be no proletarian dictatorship

At present not only avowed enemies of socialism, but also some confused "Marxists" doubt whether the working class rule and Party leadership in socialist construction are really

necessary They are looking for speculative "models" of so cialism which dispense with both Let them but remember that no country has ever begun to build socialism, let alone completed its building, without the power belonging to the working class and without the leading role of the Communist Party This should make them aware of the futility of all attempts to revise this fundamental Marxist principle

To curb and eliminate bourgeois and petty bourgeois ide ology, to infuse the consciousness of the masses with com munist ideas and on this basis to consolidate the working people, to ensure their high labour and political activity, are the ideological requirements of the new society That is the task of the Party, which tolerates no ideological vacillations and distortions, political passivity, non resistance with re spect to anti socialist forces, and organisational disunity among the working people

The Party works out the political line, strategy and tactics of the struggle, enlightens the masses politically, raises their class consciousness, reveals the aims of the struggle, and or ganises and rallies the working people. It is only under the leadership of its party that the working class can accomplish its historic mission, which is to bring about the revolutionary transformation of the exploiter system into a socialist one Lenin was absolutely right when he wrote that the proletar ian revolution develops an ". . organising talent, collec tive if not individual, without which the million strong army of the proletariat cannot achieve victory" [1]

If we are guided by true science and take historical ex perience into account, we must admit that in the contempo rary epoch the leadership of the revolutionary masses fighting for the socialist revolution by the Communist Party, its lead ership of all the aspects of the life of socialist society are a historical inevitability and a command of the times spring ing from the objective requirements of social progress

The Communist Party pursues no other interests than those of the working people, and it serves them devotedly. The people in their turn fully trust their party, rally around it and work according to its precepts

The defence of their socialist country, the strengthening of its defence potential, military development, and every

[1] V I Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol 29, p 94

thing connected with organising the masses to rebuff armed attacks by the enemy are cardinal questions of the socialist state's policy Only the Party is able to utilise fully the possibilities of socialist society and the people's forces to safeguard the security of socialism and to win victory over its enemies

The collective wisdom of the Party, the all sided consideration of the domestic and international situation, the correct decisions it takes, ensure the reliable defence of the country and of the whole socialist community, direct the development of the armed forces and their utilisation in the interests of the policies pursued by the socialist state Characterising the victory achieved by the completely ruined, poverty stricken, hungry, and virtually disarmed nascent Soviet republic, Lenin, this greatest of all realists, described as a miracle this heroic feat of the revolutionary people and of its army, this heroic feat of the Party He wrote "It was only because of the Party's vigilance and its strict discipline, because the authority of the Party united all government departments and institutions, because the slogans issued by the Central Committee were adopted by tens, hundreds, thousands and finally millions of people as one man, because incredible sacrifices were made it was only because of all this that the miracle which occurred was made possible It was only because of all this that we were able to win in spite of the campaigns of the imperialists of the Entente and of the whole world having been repeated twice, thrice and even four times "[1]

Having rebuffed the first attack of the imperialists in the Civil War, the CPSU headed the people and the army in peaceful socialist construction It overcame enormous difficulties and privations, the machinations of its numerous enemies, multiplied the strength of the country, and consolidated its defensive potential, the Army and the Navy

Under the leadership of the CPSU the Soviet people and its Armed Forces passed the heavy trials of the Second World War with honour History knows no examples, when the course of a war begun in such adverse circumstances was changed with such mastery, so completely and skilfully, and the army, guided by the wise and firm hand of

[1] V I Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol 30, p 446.

its inspirer and organiser the Leninist Party won such a great victory This is now a fact recognised by all, a fact of world historic significance

The CPSU not only ensured the mobilisation of all the material and spiritual forces in the country for the rout of the enemy, but made the military organisation of the first ever socialist state the best in the world, so that the numer ous enemies of the Soviet power were unable to vanquish it

The extensive experience of other socialist countries has also proved that the military development of a socialist country must be carried out under the direct leadership of the Communist Party

The irrefutable advantages of the socialist social and state system over the capitalist open up to the Communist Party, as the leading social force, the possibility of orga nising peaceful construction and the defence of the socialist country against armed enemies The use of these possibili ties presupposes the effective leadership of the millions of working people, a scientific and rational management of the complex social processes

The Communist Party is armed with the knowledge of the Marxist Leninist theory, knows the laws of social de velopment and war, of military science. Scientific theory illuminates its great road of struggle and victories like a beacon, helps it to formulate a correct policy and to imple ment it Characterising the politics of the Russian Bolshev iks, Lenin noted that their power was based on the com plete clarity and the sober consideration of all class magni tudes, Russian and international, on the resulting indomi table energy, firmness, decisiveness and selflessness in struggle

It is impossible to work out a correct policy, in general, and a military one, in particular, without knowing the laws of social development, without seeing the trends of events Such groping in the dark is characteristic of the behaviour of the moribund reactionary classes and their parties The Communist Party is armed with the knowledge of the victorious Marxist Leninist teaching, which is a reli able theoretical compass Its assessments taken on a large scale are always deeper and more correct than the assess ments of bourgeois parties and politicians

The Communist Party not only knows the laws of social development and war, but also skilfully applies them in all

its actions and resolves all questions in accordance with them. Some leaders of bourgeois parties may also know the laws of social development. But neither they nor their parties can act consistently in accordance with the objective laws of history because they represent the interests of reactionary classes The Communist Party, on the other hand, which follows a socialist line of struggle and decisively defends the interests of the working people, acts not in disagreement with historical necessity, but in accordance with it. This makes the Communist Party the political and ideological leader of the progressive forces, a great engine of history

In pursuing its policy the Party has the working people's complete trust and support The Party's links with the masses are determined by its close kinship with the people, are created by its consistent and resolute defence of the people's vital interests, they are also a result of the systematic educational work the Party conducts among the working people, to whom it always explains its political course. Because of that the policy of the Communist Party becomes a programme of action for the working masses, its revolutionary ideas grip the minds of the masses and become a great material force.

In pursuing its policy of revolutionary transformations and of the country's defence against imperialist attacks, the Communist Party displays firmness, tenacity and fearlessness. The Party resolutely tackles and overcomes the difficulties connected with the building and the armed defence of the new society, resolutely fights for unity in its ranks, and constantly multiplies its strength Ideological and organisational cohesion is the most important source of the Party's invincibility, a guarantee for the successful fulfilment of the great tasks of communist construction

The Party courageously develops the criticism and self criticism of shortcomings in its ranks, is not afraid to reveal such shortcomings, and takes decisive measures to correct them Lenin considered that the most important feature of a serious party is its willingness frankly to admit its mistakes, to uncover the causes responsible for them and to outline ways for correcting them and considered its attitude to its own mistakes the truest criterion of the Party's wisdom and of the practical fulfilment of its duties towards

the working masses The development of inner Party democracy and criticism helps the Communist Party choose correct ways for the triumphant advance towards communism, to organise and lead the people of the country, and to ensure the reliable defence of the socialist country.

Main Directions of the Party's Leadership of the Defence of the Socialist Country

The leadership of the defence of the socialist country by the Marxist Leninist Party is expressed first and foremost in *the Party's formulation of the state's military policy on the basis of which the people and the army act to ensure the country's security.* The planning and manufacture of arms, the training of military personnel, military research, various mobilisation measures, the formation of defensive alliances, the diplomatic practice, etc, are all determined by that policy.

The Party works out the military doctrine of the state which, on the basis of an evaluation of the character of modern war and its requirements, on the basis of the political, economic, military and scientific and technological possibilities of one's own country and the probable opponent, determines the main trends for the development in the military field, in general, and the main principles for the development of the armed forces, in particular. The doctrine expresses the main political principles guiding the state in its defence activities and the army in its development and combat activities

The Party determines the aims and the content of the ideological work conducted among the people and the troops This work ensures the political, patriotic and internationalist education of the civilians and troops, prepares them for the trials of war ideologically and psychologically It keeps up the high morale of the people and the troops, and raises the fighting spirit and combat efficiency of the soldiers.

A most important task of the Party is to prepare, educate and to place correctly the military leaders who are the main organising force in the troops. With their help it can give constant and comprehensive guidance to the life and the combat activities of all army organisms, from the sub unit to the armed forces as a whole

Through its Central Committee the Party directs the political work in the troops, guides and controls the activity

of the central bodies of the Army and Navy, sees to it that they consistently and efficiently implement Party directives in the development of the armed forces It acts as the organiser of all vitally important measures in defence and military development, and mobilises the working people and troops for the practical implementation of its military policy

The ideological and organisational work of the Party is essential to secure the efficient, scientific management of the building of communism and of its defence

Without corresponding ideas and without the working out in the masses of the necessary motives, without ideological work, it is impossible to rally and organise large masses of people and to mobilise them for the implementation of social tasks In their turn, ideas alone cannot tangibly affect social activity. Ideas, Karl Marx said, become a material force, acquire material power that is able to change the world only if classes and peoples act in accordance with them An idea can assume a material form only in man's practical activity.

In its turn the practical activity of people, especially the actions of large masses of people, must be organised Hence, for the activity of the Party in its leadership of the masses to be successful, it must combine ideological with organisational work

The modern stage of historical development is characterised by a sharp exacerbation in the ideological struggle between capitalism and socialism Alongside with its intensified preparations for a war against the USSR and other socialist countries, international, notably US imperialism, steps up its subversive political and ideological activity against the socialist states, the communist and the democratic movement as a whole This makes it even more important to wage an irreconcilable struggle against hostile ideology, decisively to expose imperialist schemes, to extend the communist education of Party members and all working people, and to step up the entire ideological activity of the Party.

The Party's ideological work is the decisive means for constantly strengthening the morale of the people and the army of a socialist state. Cultivating socialist ideas in the minds of people, the Party awakens in them love for their country, staunchness, resolve and fearlessness in struggle,

the willingness to make sacrifices for the sake of victory over the enemy, mass heroism among the officers and men, an indomitable will to vanquish any aggressor

The Communist Party ensures the ideological and psychological prerequisites needed for people to make the change from work in production or any other peaceful field of endeavour to the service in the army By its ideological work it imbues the soldiers with a high sense of duty, a sense of their personal responsibility for the fate of the country, a willingness to stand any trial for the sake of the freedom and independence of the socialist country.

When the socialist state is compelled to wage war, the Communist Party shows the people the seriousness of the danger threatening the country, reveals the predatory aims of the imperialist aggressors, makes the people deeply aware of the just character of the war waged by them, fosters their patriotism, their national and military pride, instils in them confidence in the ultimate victory over the enemy

The high morale of the people and the army of the socialist state is their main advantage over the imperialists. But, for the moral force to become a material one and to secure victory, it must be expressed in practical deeds, in the labour enthusiasm of the people, in the organised and resolute actions of the troops on the fields of battle, in the insistent acquisition of combat skills in peacetime.

Speaking of the political forms of struggle Lenin said that "only with the aid of an excellent organisation can we turn our moral strength into material strength".[1] Such excellent organisation is ensured by the leadership of the Party By its active organisational work the Party directs the spiritual and physical strength of the people and the army to the fulfilment of the tasks ensuring victory in the war The high conscientiousness and military enthusiasm of the people and the troops, the patriotic feelings and will for victory developed in them by the Party are transformed into organised, decisive actions by the troops at the front and into labour heroism by the people in the rear.

The organisational work of the Communist Party embraces the entire extensive and diversified army organism.

---

[1] V I Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 8, p 145

Possessing a flexible and mobile system of organisation, using a great variety of methods, skilfully combining educational and administrative measures, discipline and the creativity of the masses, and notably the force of the personal example of Communists, the Party uses all material and moral possibilities of the Army and Navy to raise their combat efficiency and combat preparedness, to educate and organise the troops.

Naturally, the growth in the number of Communists in the Soviet Armed Forces brings with it an improvement of their combat efficiency.

During the Great Patriotic War the CPSU carried out several mass mobilisations of its members into the army in the field and made it easier for the best officers and men to join the Party. At the end of 1941 there were about 1,300,000 Communists in the army or 42.4 per cent of the total Party membership, in 1942 there were more than 2 million Communists under arms, or 54.3 per cent of the total Party membership, this despite the fact that the Party lost about 400,000 of its members on the front during the grimmest period of the war. Work is underway to set up effective Party organisations in Army and Navy units, primary Party organisations in battalions and equivalent units. At present 22 per cent of the Army and Navy ranks are Party, and over 60 per cent, Komsomol members.

Thus, by its ideological and organisational work the Party mobilises all the material and spiritual strength of the socialist country and people for securing the reliable defence of the country.

The content of the above enumerated basic directions in the Party's leadership depends on the country's concrete development conditions and the specific features of the relevant war. The Communist Party works out a scientific programme of action for the state and Party bodies, voluntary organisations and the entire people. It determines the ways for switching the economy and the whole life of the country to military lines, mobilising the working people for the rebuff of the enemy, directly guides the armed struggle at the fronts and the partisan movement, carries out enormous ideological work, takes care to build up the moral political potential during the war, and transforms it into a material force.

Every war the Soviet people had to fight proceeded in very specific international and domestic conditions and set to the people and the Party concrete tasks in overcoming the difficulties standing in the way of victory.

During the Civil War the Bolshevik Party faced seemingly unsurmountable difficulties the population was tired of the imperialist slaughter, dislocation and hunger reigned supreme, the requisite arms and materials were unavailable, there was a shortage of commanders in the army, then in the formative stage The entire bourgeois world prophesied that Soviet Russia was about to collapse The Party, however, was able to mobilise forces to overcome all these difficulties and to defend the gains of the revolution

The experience of the Great Patriotic War of 1941 1945 is also instructive This war was the most difficult of all wars the Soviet Union ever had to fight The trials the Soviet people had to stand in the beginning of the war were particularly grim The enormous army of the nazis and their satellites, in a frenzy of chauvinism and racialism, penetrated deep into the USSR

The nazis used the temporary advantage given them by the militarisation of the economy and all of life in Germany, by the long preparations for the annexationist war and their experience in military actions gained in the West, by the superiority in equipment and manpower they had concentrated on the borders of the Soviet Union They also had at their disposal the economic and military resources of virtually all of Western Europe

Mistakes in the assessment of the time of the German attack of the USSR, and the consequent neglect in the preparations to repel the initial attacks also had a telling effect Also, the Soviet troops had at that time little experience in the waging of large scale operations typical of modern warfare However, even the early stages of the war demonstrated that the nazi military adventure was doomed to failure

The whole Soviet people rose in a body in defence of the country The Party's slogan "Everything for the front, everything for victory!" was enthusiastically taken up by the working class, the collective farmers and the Soviet intelligentsia. The CPSU headed the people's war against the invaders

Faith in the great ideals of communism, in the correctness of the Party's policy and leadership, the selflessness of Communists in the struggle for the just cause and for the freedom and happiness of the working people, all this indissolubly united the Party and the people in the struggle against the enemy. This unity formed that miraculous alloy that stood the acid test to which the Soviet people were subjected in defending their socialist homeland

The Communists were a fount of strength in the defence of the Soviet country Their heroic exploits at the front and in the rear inspired the people in their fight against the invaders. Mass heroism was displayed by the people who at this critical juncture were deeply aware of the need for it

In revolutionary liberation wars of the past people also displayed heroism in battle But. in wars of the presocialist epoch the broad masses could not use their potentialities to the full, could not fully dedicate themselves to the fulfilment of the tasks advanced by the revolutionary war Class contradictions, the ideology of the ruling exploiter class, the low level of political consciousness and weak organisation, all told on their actions

True heroism is born of a feeling of high responsibility to one s people, to one's country In summing up the results of the heroic struggle of the young Soviet republic against the counter revolutionaries, Lenin drew the conclusion that "a nation in which the majority of the workers and peasants realise, feel and see that they are fighting for their own Soviet power, for the rule of the working people, for the cause whose victory will ensure them and their children all the benefits of culture, of all that has been created by human labour such a nation can never be vanquished" [1]

The Great Patriotic War (1941 1945) proved the correctness of Lenin's words with special force

The working class demonstrated outstanding heroism during the evacuation of industrial plants from frontline areas to the eastern parts of the country In all, some 1,360 big state enterprises were evacuated and soon began to produce arms and ammunition for the front

Under the leadership of the Communist Party the Soviet people exerted heroic efforts to overcome the enemy's numerical superiority in tanks, aircraft and automatic weap

[1] V I Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol 29, p 319

ons In 1944 the country produced 8 times the number of tanks it had produced at the beginning of the war, 7 times the number of guns, 4 times more planes, 8 times more mortars, and 4 times more ammunition The Soviet people stayed for days, weeks, and sometimes months at their enterprises, refused to take days off and vacations

The collective farm peasants too exhibited heroic self lessness Despite the sharp decrease in farming machinery and labour power, they managed to supply light industry with raw materials and the army and population with food

The Party and the Soviet people did everything possible to build up the Armed Forces, who were faced with a task of enormous difficulty. They had to stem the nazi advance, stabilise the front, exhaust the enemy in defensive battles and to accumulate sufficient strength to mount a decisive offensive and to rout the invaders

From the first days of the war people of all the nationalities inhabiting the Soviet Union joined the Armed Forces, hundreds of thousands of patriots volunteered In Moscow, in the first three days of the war, for example, 50,000 Komsomol members volunteered for the front Applications flooded the Military Commissariats in other towns as well Many thousands of citizens, who because of their age and state of health were not subject to conscription, asked to be enlisted in the army in the field.

A people's voluntary corps was formed immediately after the nazi invasion In Moscow 11 voluntary divisions, incorporating 137,000 people, were formed in four days, more than 300,000 people joined the corps in Leningrad alone

When the war was in the second month anti sabotage battalions had been formed in all towns and district centres In Moscow and the Moscow region there were 87 of them

The Party and Government worked hard to raise the combat efficiency of the Army and Navy Alongside with improving the combat training of the troops, and supplying them with everything necessary, all persons of draft age and reservists were mobilised as quickly as possible

The Communist Party took a number of important measures which raised the political consciousness of the troops, made them more disciplined and staunch in battle, and improved the troop leadership The Party directed its best people to the army Almost one third of the members and

candidates to the Central Committee of the CPSU, many Secretaries of the Central Committees of the Communist Parties of the Union Republics, territorial and regional committees were appointed members of the military councils of the fronts and the armies

At the decision of the CC several large scale mobilisation campaigns were launched to enlist Party and Komsomol members Up to October 1941, some 94,000 Party members were sent to the army in the field In July and November 1941, at the decision of the Central Committee, the Party sent 48,000 of its members holding leading posts to the army in the field Studies were interrupted at many Party schools and courses and the students became political instructors in the army During the first year of the war up to 1,000,000 Party members joined the ranks The Party had become a fighting body.

The Party CC adopted measures to increase the proportion of Party members in the armed services by drawing servicemen into the Party In the first half of 1941 about 27,000 people became members of the Party or candidates for membership, while more than 126,000 joined in the second half year By the end of the war there were 3 5 million Party members in the Army and Navy, that is, almost 60 per cent of the Party membership

The heroic efforts of the people and the army under the leadership of the Communist Party foiled Hitler's plan of a Blitzkrieg against the USSR. Conditions were created for a decisive counter offensive by the Soviet Army The Soviet people succeeded in bringing about a radical turning point in the war The Soviet armies took the offensive near Moscow, Stalingrad, Kursk, on the Dnieper and in other places Later the Soviet Armed Forces drove the enemy back to Germany, where the rout of the Wehrmacht was completed

In the battles against the German invaders and Japanese militarists the Soviet troops displayed a high political awareness and morale, which found expression in the mass heroism of all ranks About 13 million soldiers received high government awards for their courage and bravery in battle Heroism and bravery were exhibited by soldiers of all nationalities of the Soviet Union

In the course of the war the Soviet servicemen insistently

improved their combat skills, perfected the means and forms of armed struggle. The CPSU created the requisite conditions for the development of military art, for the commanders to be able to show their military talents It reared a great body of commanders and political instructors of all levels, who showed exceptional ability, high political consciousness and exceptional skill in leading their men under any conditions.

The mass heroism of the Soviet people was strikingly demonstrated by the powerful partisan movement in the occupied areas The success in the struggle against the enemy was greatly promoted by the creation at the very beginning of the war of strong underground Party organisations, which rallied a great number of activists round them and headed the mass partisan movement

A few figures will serve to illustrate this In 1942 fifteen underground Party district committees were functioning in the Orel Region. 9 underground regional committees, uniting 174 Party committees and over 1,297 primary organisations, in Byelorussia Three regional committees and 15 district committees were functioning in the Smolensk Region In the Ukraine there were 14 underground regional committees, 154 town and district committees and 725 primary Party organisations Two regional, 20 district and town committees were set up in Lithuania, 2 regional and 3 district underground Party committees in Latvia, 2 area and 11 inter district Party centres were functioning in the Leningrad Region. Underground Party and Komsomol organisations were set up in many other enemy held areas

Between 1942 and 1943, over a thousand partisan detachments, uniting hundreds of thousands of Soviet patriots, were active in these areas During the first two years of the war alone the partisans destroyed over 300,000 invaders, among them 30 generals. 6,336 officers, 1,520 pilots, and took 2,747 prisoners During that time they blew up 3,263 bridges, 3,000 enemy trains, destroyed or captured 476 planes, 1,267 tanks and armoured cars, 541 guns, 2,320 machine guns, 14,645 lorries and cars and a lot of other equipment. The Soviet partisans greatly assisted the advancing Soviet troops in liberating several regions and republics

The nazi Command was compelled to throw enormous forces into battle against Soviet partisans As early as the

autumn of 1942, they numbered 144 police battalions, 27 police regiments, 8 other regiments, 10 police guard and punitive SS divisions, 2 guard corps, up to 15 German field, 5 Hungarian infantry divisions and 72 special units As of mid 1942 some 10 per cent of the German land forces on the Soviet German front were used against the partisans In addition the nazis had to pin down considerable forces for "passive" operations against partisans (the guarding of railway lines and other vital communications) However, these measures were unable to curtail the scale of the partisan movement noticeably

The Party led the country to victory by using to the full the advantages of the socialist system, mobilising the people and the army for the war against the invaders, uniting all the forces of Soviet society and directing them to the task of routing the enemy.

International Importance of the CPSU's Experience in Defending the Socialist Motherland

The historical experience of the CPSU in organising the defence of the socialist country and winning the war has become the property of all the Communist and Workers' Parties in the socialist countries In using this experience they take into account the new alignment of the socio political and military political forces in the world, the concrete situation in the individual countries and their relations with other states

The Communist and Workers' Parties take into account. firstly, that peace offers the best conditions for the building of socialism and communism in the countries where the socialist revolution has triumphed, and for the development of the world revolution in general They therefore consider it their prime task to fight for the consolidation of peace, for averting a new world war and for banning wars from the life of society even before the victory of socialism on a world scale The Marxist Leninist Parties fight untiringly for the establishment of new relations between peoples and countries, based on the principles of equality, sovereignty, non interference in internal affairs and peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems

Secondly the Communist and Workers' Parties realise that the struggle for peace does not in itself guarantee the security of socialism, does not make it unnecessary for the

socialist community to strengthen its defence *The dialectics of modern world development are such that peace can not be preserved if the military might of imperialism is not confronted by the superior military might of the socialist system* The forces of peace and socialism have to do with an opponent to whom considerations of humaneness, morality, international law, the natural right of all peoples for independent development are no more than a fig leaf they use to conceal their aggressive aims US aggression against the Vietnamese people demonstrates this strikingly US imperialism has never rejected the idea of armed struggle against socialism and the people's liberation movement but, on the contrary, constantly builds up military power for such a battle Imperialism has great military strength and is ready to use it as soon as the opportunity arises

Armed resistance cannot be crushed by other than military means The revolution must know how to defend itself the law of the class struggle demands that So long as there is armed imperialism and hence the danger of war the Party has no way out but to strengthen the defensive capacity of the Soviet state and the entire socialist system, to maintain it at a level sufficiently high totally to destroy any aggressor who would dare to attack the socialist countries

Historical experience demonstrates that whereas the growth of the military might of an exploiter state inevitably intensifies its aggressiveness, the growth of the military might of socialism plays a directly opposite social role it serves as a bulwark of peace, becomes an international force in the struggle against aggression, an insurmountable obstacle to the unleashing of wars by the imperialists

The Communist Parties therefore do everything to strengthen the defence capacity of their states, to redouble their economic, scientific, technological, moral political and military potentials They take measures to provide the army with the latest equipment, to improve the principles guiding military development, the combat training and political education of the troops, to develop military science and to raise the combat preparedness of the armed forces

Thirdly the Communist and Workers' Parties take into account that the defence of socialism has now become a direct internationalist concern it is secured by the efforts of

all socialist states, the friendship and co operation of their armies The Communist Parties strengthen the political and military unity of the socialist countries, which is expressed in their co ordinated foreign policy, the co ordination of their economic plans, the development of the defence efforts of the states, the education of their peoples and armies in the spirit of socialist internationalism and fraternal mu tual assistance The Communist Parties give much atten tion to consolidating the friendship and co operation of the armies of the socialist states, to exchanging experience in armed forces development, training and educating the troops, training commanders and developing military science

To defend socialism and promote the revolutionary pro cess it is necessary to consolidate the world communist movement, strengthen the unity of the socialist states and their defence potential, utterly to smash ideologically and isolate the splitters and renegades of socialism The Marxist Leninist Parties fight insistently to strengthen the cohesion of the world communist movement and the socialist coun tries *The constant growth of the economic and military might of the socialist system, of the unity of all socialist forces, their greater vigilance against enemy schemes guar antee the security of the socialist countries and their future victories over imperialism*

Fourthly when faced with the necessity directly to rebuff imperialist military attacks, the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries use the rich experience the CPSU has in transforming the entire country into a single military camp They direct their efforts to switch the econ omy and the whole life of the country to military lines, to make the masses aware of the great danger threatening their socialist country and to raise the morale of the people, who are defending their independence and socialist way of life.

Fifthly, the Marxist Leninist Parties attentively study and generalise the experience of the "little wars" unleashed by the imperialists and use it to strengthen the defence of their countries and to raise the combat efficiency and combat readiness of their armed forces This experience shows that today, more than ever before, it is necessary to be vigilant and able to repel any aggression

Chapter Four

THE ARMED FORCES OF THE CAPITALIST COUNTRIES SPECIFIC FEATURES OF THE ARMIES OF THE YOUNG NATIONAL STATES

A sociological analysis of war as a socio political phe nomenon is indissoluble from an elucidation of the social nature and political purpose of the army The army[1] is the main instrument of war, a special organisation of the state or of an oppressed class or a military force of an oppressed people that has risen against its foreign oppressors It serves to implement the policies of some class by means of armed force According to Engels it is "the organised body of armed men which a state maintains for purposes of of fensive or defensive wars" [2]

The social nature of the army, a basic organ of a state is determined by the class nature of the state A study of the purpose, the functions and the tasks of the army in general without a specific consideration of its political es sence would be meaningless

[1] The concept army has several meanings first the armed forces in general second the land forces as distinct from the other services for example the Navy and the Air Force thirdly the operational large unit including corps divisions and other units Where no indication is given to the contrary the concept army is used in this book in the first meaning

[2] *The New American Cyclopaedia* Vol II New York 1858 p 123

1 THE SOCIAL NATURE AND THE PURPOSE OF THE ARMIES OF EXPLOITER STATES

The army is an important element of the political superstructure of definite relations of production that have shaped in the course of history and form the objective social foundation, the economic basis of society The armed forces of the exploiter state are a "military copy" of the socio economic structure and political system of the relevant exploiter society, which determines their purpose, and the principles underlying their development, training and education

To understand the political purpose of the army in exploiter society we must look back at the historical process that led to the emergence of the state and to the formation of special detachments of armed people charged with the task of fulfilling its internal and external functions

The Origin and Class Essence of the Army

The army emerged on the same socio historical basis that gave birth to war The history of war, the state and the army is organically linked with the emergence and development of antagonistic societies In pre class tribal societies there were neither social inequality nor political relations between people Under the primeval system there were no armies functioning as special military organisations According to Engels 'armed" force was at that time a "self acting" organisation of the entire adult population charged with the task of seizing and defending the conditions necessary for the subsistence of the tribe Such an organisation could serve neither as an instrument of oppression within the clan or tribe, nor as an instrument for the enslavement of other tribes

With the disintegration of the primeval system and its tribal self government, its "military" organisation, too, began to disintegrate Together with the armed tribe there emerged detachments of the well to do élite, representatives of the tribal aristocracy, who formed the nucleus of the permanent troops These detachments became the social prop, the instrument of the power of military leaders and the slave owning tribal aristocracy They were, in fact, the embryo of the army

During the disintegration of the tribal system in Greece

(the beginning of the first millenium B C) the armed forces were still organised as a people s militia Every phratry (a union of several close kins) had its military leader, who decided military questions with the participation of the trib al communities At the same time the military campaigns increased the inequality of wealth between the members of the tribe, made the tribal elite richer, strengthened the power of the military leader and his troops Relying on the economic domination of the class of big owners that had already emerged by then, the military leaders and the lead ers of the tribe took the power into their hands The state, the apparatus for the coercion and exploitation of the peo ple, emerged in this way

The exploiter class sets up armed detachments to strength en its economic and political rule These detachments are maintained by the state and are obedient tools in the hands of the exploiters These tools are directed against the people and serve as a means for the violent implementation of the policies of the ruling classes

The decisive role of the army in the system of the emer gent state power was determined by the slave owning sys tem's main task, which is to ensure the violent exploitation of the slaves and their systematic replenishment by the sei zure and subjugation of other peoples From this sprang the two basic functions of the slave owning state 1) to keep the exploited masses in the country in obedience and 2) to subdue other countries and protect its own territory against foreign invaders These functions, endemic in all exploiter states, determine the social nature and the purpose of their armed forces

A distinctive feature of the army of an exploiter state is that it is isolated from the people and serves as an in strument for their enslavement This was the case in slave owning, as well as in feudal society The feudal system ini tially emerged as a military organisation The army of the feudal state was intended for waging predatory wars

Capitalism transformed armed violence into a system The development of the army and military science made spectacular advances in the early 19th century The bour geoisie renewed and re equipped the army, made it an even stronger weapon of class rule within the country and of its annexationist policy in the international arena

Being a state organ, the army in an antagonistic society always acts as an instrument for the implementation of the policies pursued by the ruling classes The economic interests of the exploiters, expressed in the politics of the state, ultimately determine the social function and essence of the armed forces *In all antagonistic formations the army is created and developed by the ruling class for the purpose of strengthening the exploiter system and suppressing the masses, for the social and national oppression of the working people and for the plunder and enslavement of other peoples*

The socio political functions of the army determine the composition of its commanding echelon and the method of recruitment and organisation During the history of exploiter society the methods used for the manning of the forces changed considerably, at times they were made up only of the representatives of the ruling classes (for example, the knights in the Middle Ages), at other times they were extended and became a people's militia (especially during liberation wars) At all times, however, the commanding posts were held exclusively by the ruling classes

Social Functions of the Armed Forces of the Capitalist States

All bourgeois armies, irrespective of their social structure, serve as the principal means of asserting the economic and political rule of the capitalists, as a means of suppressing the working people in the country and enslaving the peoples of other countries Their internal and external functions are closely interlinked

The internal function of the armies of bourgeois states is determined by the nature of capitalism and springs from it The bourgeoisie uses various means to intensify the exploitation of the proletariat, and the social and national oppression of the working people Chief among them was and remains coercion with the help of the army and the police

The army serves as the internal prop of the capitalist system Its main function is an inner political one "Everywhere, in all countries," Lenin wrote, "the standing army is used not so much against the external enemy as against the internal enemy Everywhere the standing army has become the weapon of reaction, the servant of capital in its

struggle against labour, the executioner of the people's liberty "[1]

The reactionary role of the army within the capitalist state is combined with its *foreign political function of oppressing the peoples of foreign countries The annexationist policy of capitalism is implemented by means of armed violence, the instrument for which is the army* Its main purpose is not to defend its own country, but to attack other countries in order to rob and enslave the working people Defence is only derivative of the universal striving of the exploiters after attack The weaker states, falling victim to aggression by a strong predator, are compelled to defend themselves

Bourgeois armies always behaved savagely and inhumanly towards their own and other peoples As early as the mid 19th century the British troops heaped ignominy on themselves during the suppression of the popular uprisings in India and during the 'opium" wars in China Marx noted that in those wars "the English soldiery committed abominations for the mere fun mere wanton sports" [2] The same can be said of the behaviour of the US forces during their expeditions against the Red Indians and the suppression of the Philippino people's liberation movement in 1899 One sixth of the population of Lucon, the biggest and most densely populated island of the Philippino Archipelago, was annihilated Mass executions and the torture of peaceful inhabitants aroused the indignation of the world public, and all progressives (including Leo Tolstoy and Mark Twain) protested against the atrocities perpetrated by the American troops

While they are aggressive with respect to weak countries, bourgeois states have to defend themselves when they are attacked by stronger capitalist rivals Under these conditions the armed forces may carry out the general national task of defending their country against foreign invaders When the struggle is waged against aggression, for the national independence and state sovereignty of the country, the interests of the working people may in this respect coincide with those of the ruling classes, without, however, re

[1] V I Lenin *Collected Works* Vol 10 p 56
[2] K Marx and F Engels *The First Indian War of Independence 1857 1859* Moscow p 92

moving social antagonisms and the class struggle Such wars do not change the essence of the army itself a weapon of the bourgeoisie, it defends the country notably in the interests of the ruling class

Hence, when studying such periods in the life of bourgeois armies we should bear in mind, first, that the function of the country's defence is in sharp contradiction with the nature of the capitalist state and is determined by external circumstances attacks by other aggressive states, second, that the struggle against the aggressor does not change the social nature and function of the armies of capitalist states, that of being a weapon for the oppression of their own people and for the enslavement of other countries The social nature of the army can be changed only if the class content of the state is changed first

The bourgeoisie and its theoreticians conceal the true social essence and the real purpose of the armed forces of exploiter society Arguing that the capitalist army is made up of all the social layers of the population, bourgeois ideologists assert that it is an "extra class" organisation, designed to carry out "general national" functions, and try to convince servicemen that the army acts in the interest of the whole people A special "people's" organisation, they say, it stands outside of politics and the class struggle But the army comprises part of the state apparatus of the political organisation of the ruling class and the bourgeoisie does not at all intend to give up its command of the army At the same time it endeavours to isolate the army from the people and to make it an obedient instrument of the state policy In this the bourgeoisie runs up against deep contradictions, that between the people and the army, and that between the ranks and the officers within the army itself

The bourgeoisie strains efforts to mitigate these antagonisms by confining the soldiers to their barracks in order to isolate them from the people, by resorting to cruel, stupefying drill, by brainwashing the personnel, and so on it adopts a strict class approach to the manning of the troops, especially of the officer corps The latter is formed of representatives of the ruling classes and holds not only a commanding, but also a dominant position The relation between the officers and the rank and file reflects the class

relations in exploiter society—the relations of domination and subordination. The officers train their soldiers and direct their actions in the interests of the ruling classes of bourgeois society. The officer corps is, as it were, the bearer of bourgeois ideology and politics. The all-sided indoctrination of soldiers and sailors during their service in the armed forces makes them willing tools of the capitalist state.

Intensification of the Reactionary Role of the Bourgeois Army Under Imperialism

The development of capitalism and the further intensification of its contradictions have of necessity led to the numerical growth of the army and to a build-up of armaments in bourgeois states. While the slave-owning and feudal formations wars involved tens of thousands of soldiers, when capitalism was asserting itself they involved hundreds of thousands. Thus, only 136,000 people participated in the battle of Cannae on both sides, while in the capitalist epoch armies became many million strong. During the First World War about 50 million people were under arms, in the Second—110 million.

Analysing the development of capitalism, Engels noted that the final division of the colonies between the big capitalist countries, and the stabilisation of that division, had led to a major intensification of militarism. He wrote: "The army has become the main purpose of the state, and an end in itself; the peoples are there only to provide soldiers and feed them. Militarism dominates and is swallowing Europe."[1] The transition to monopoly capitalism triggered off a particularly violent growth of militarism. The military power of the imperialist states increased rapidly. The armies of France, Britain, Italy, Russia, Germany and Austria-Hungary grew from 2,111,000 men in 1869 to 13,184,000 in 1912. Military expenditure grew even more intensely. In Japan it increased 15-fold between 1875 and 1909, in Germany (1882-1908) almost three-fold, and in the USA (1875-1908) almost four-fold.

Lenin noted two trends in the development of militarism: it develops as a weapon in the hands of the ruling classes for the suppression of the proletariat's revolutionary move-

[1] F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, 1969, p. 204.

ment in its own country and as a military force for the so ution of foreign political tasks

Imperialism intensifies political reaction in every way The bourgeoisie abolishes democratic laws and takes re course to arbitrary rule and coercion, and strives to sup press the growing revolutionary struggle of the working class by force of arms Militarism becomes the main weap on of the bourgeoisie's political rule and of the oppres sion of the proletariat Enormous numbers of working peo ple are drawn into the army where they are subjected to ideological and psychological indoctrination in order to strengthen the social hierarchy, the exploiter relations of domination and subordination Lenin said that the bourgeois army is the most ossified instrument for supporting the old regime, the most hardened bulwark of bourgeois discipline, buttressing up the rule of the capital, and preserving and fostering among the working people the servile spirit of sub mission and subjection to capital [1]

The growth of militarism falls in with the economic in terests of the monopolies both within the country and out side it The monopolists claims to world domination create the economic foundation for the flourishing of militarism in all capitalist countries Under imperialism militarism acquires an all embracing and particularly aggressive character The militarists begin to dominate society and all of life in the capitalist countries is subordinated to the reactionary aims of annexationist wars The armed forces are the in strument of the imperialists aggressive policies

This purpose of the armies in the capitalist states became evident already during the First World War, when the im perialist predators frenziedly fought for the redivision of the colonies and the expansion of spheres for the applica tion of capital The purpose of the imperialist armies be came even more reactionary during the Second World War, when the nazis wanted to strangle the first socialist state by armed force and to conquer world supremacy

The First and the Second World Wars hastened the co alescence of the capitalist monopolies with the bourgeois state, while state monopoly capitalism led to a further in tensification of militarism A close union has formed be

[1] V I Lenin *Collected Works* Vol 28 p 284

tween the army big brass and monopoly capital, and between monopoly capital and the top leaders of the state State leadership has increasingly fallen under the influence of reactionary generals and monopolies in war production The state has become a committee for managing the affairs of the monopoly bourgeoisie, the armed forces a weapon for the implementation of their imperialist politics

2 THE ARMED FORCES OF MODERN IMPERIALIST STATES AGGRESSIVE MILITARY POLITICAL BLOCS

The deepening of the general crisis of capitalism in the post war years and the intensification of its contradictions have made the politics of imperialism more adventuristic It now constitutes an ever greater danger to the peoples, to peace and social progress The imperialists are preparing a new world war, and have repeatedly provoked international crises, which have pushed mankind to the brink of a thermonuclear conflict

US imperialism has become the most aggressive force of international imperialist reaction It is marked by a ferocious hatred of socialism and the revolutionary movement, adventurism and the striving to establish its domination all over the world There are reactionary forces in other capitalist countries as well, especially in the countries participating in imperialist military blocs The network of imperialist military blocs, and the possession by the USA of nuclear missiles have enhanced the adventurism of imperialism All this has wrought certain changes in the purpose and the functions of the armed forces of the imperialist states, has made them even more reactionary and aggressive

Attempts to Resolve Modern Contradictions by New Methods

The striving of imperialism to resolve contemporary contradictions by military means has determined the specific role the armed forces play in imperialist politics The imperialists spearhead their military might first and foremost against the great revolutionary forces of our epoch the world socialist system, the revolutionary movement of the working class in

the capitalist countries, and the national liberation move ment Imperialism regards the struggle against the forces of socialism as a twin function of militarism, combining simultaneously internal and external tasks The entire train ing of the imperialist armies is permeated with the ide ology and politics of anti communism

With the change in the relation of forces between the capitalist and socialist systems in favour of the latter, in ternational imperialist reaction, notably US imperialism, is staking its future on mass destruction weapons The impe rialists are attempting to counter the decisive role of the masses in social life and in modern wars by the force of modern weapons They are trying to use the revolution in military affairs to exterminate socialism This can be clearly seen from the postwar doctrines of the Western powers

When it adopted the "massive nuclear retaliation" strat egy soon after the Second World War, the USA expected that by its nuclear monopoly it would be able to force the Soviet Union to capitulate and that capitalism would be re stored in the socialist countries The US imperialists nurtured the idea of unleashing a destructive nuclear war to do away with socialism At the same time they thought that they would be able to use nuclear weapons when the USSR be gan to assist the revolutionary forces in other countries in their struggle for national independence and social pro gress

But the "massive nuclear retaliation" strategy was still born Before US imperialism was able to stockpile enough nuclear weapons to exert a substantial influence on the course and outcome of the intended war, the Soviet Union had itself created powerful nuclear and thermonuclear weapons and means for their delivery to target, and was capable of striking a destructive retaliatory blow at the ag gressor in any part of the globe

The "flexible response" strategy which emerged as a consequence of the reappraisal following the loss by the US of its nuclear monopoly, laid down the main task of the US armed forces in the new situation It is described in the Field Service Regulations (FM 100 5) introduced in Feb ruary 1962 According to these Regulations the US armed forces are charged with the following tasks a to prepare

for world nuclear war, b to unleash and conduct local wars with conventional weapons or the limited application of nuclear arms, c to conduct the "cold war"

Hence, the extermination of socialism continues to be one of the main objectives of the US armed forces and those of the other imperialist states But since a world nuclear war is extremely dangerous for imperialism now, the "flexible response" strategy lays special emphasis on local wars against the socialist countries and the national liberation movement to be waged with conventional weapons

The "cold war" is one of the means of masking the police function of the US armed forces " The basic characteristic of cold war," the Service Regulations say, "is the absence of overt armed conflict between the military forces of the contending nations' [1] Alongside with ideological influence, political pressure, and the subversive activity of the impe rialist intelligence services, imperialist ideologists include in the "cold war" concept military blackmail and the covert use of military force against the socialist states, the revo lutionary liberation struggle of the working people in the capitalist countries and the national liberation movements of the oppressed peoples

The US armed forces are also assigned the task of con ducting 'special' wars, which are also included in the "cold war' concept A secret instruction signed by the Chief of Staff of the US Army, which was captured by the South Vietnamese guerillas, regards as "special" the colonial and civil wars waged by puppet governments with US arms under the guidance of US "advisers" and 'instructors", and with the participation of US troops There are thousands of US military experts in many countries, who teach local troops "methods of internal defence" or, in other words, how to fight the national liberation and democratic move ments

The West European accomplices of the US aggressors in imperialist plunder take pains not to lag behind the "main partner" The British, Belgian and other colonialists at tempt to set up despotic military regimes in the newly in dependent states They support reactionary officer cliques,

[1] *Field Service Regulations Operations (FM 100 5) Headquarters, Department of the Army* February 1962 p 5

sow national and racial strife in those countries in order to make "Asians fight Asians" and "Africans fight Africans

Contradictions Arising During the Formation of Mass Imperialist Armies

The experience of the First and Second World Wars demonstrated that mass armies, consisting mainly of representatives of the exploited classes, are not as reliable as the imperialists would like them to be But the imperialists cannot do without mass armies, for modern wars could not be waged without them

The imperialists are using various means in their attempts to make mass armies reliable In their view the establishment of a fascist regime, the physical destruction and isolation of the most conscious representatives notably of the working class and of the progressive intelligentsia are particularly effective in this respect This was done in nazi Germany, fascist Italy and militarist Japan This is being done in Spain, in Portugal, in Greece and covertly also in several other capitalist countries

However, these measures of the imperialist bourgeoisie cannot ensure high morale and combat qualities of their soldiers for any length of time On the contrary, they only accelerate the maturing of a revolutionary situation and invigorate the struggle of the progressive forces in those countries

In all imperialist armies great care is taken to isolate the privates and NCOs from the people, from class conscious proletarians, from the progressive forces For this purpose they enlist young people who are unable to find a job or who have not yet had time to become active in the class struggle In some countries military service is not compulsory and men are enlisted or hired on contract for terms of 3, 7, 12 or more years

The theoretical basis with which the setting up of armed forces consisting of professional soldiers is being underpinned is that the future war will supposedly be decided by rapid battles involving troops of the first strategic echelon and that these troops must therefore be equipped with the most perfect weapons, must have a high combat efficiency and combat preparedness

The USA has a conscription law, but a large part of the privates and non commissioned officers are hired Many join

the forces because of constant unemployment and the comparatively high wages being paid to hired men, NCOs and specialists

In West Germany part of the men enlisted in the Bundeswehr in accordance with the conscription law remain in the forces on a contract signed after the 18 months of compulsory service have expired In the Navy, for example, 90 per cent of the privates and NCOs are volunteers serving for terms ranging from 3 to 12 years Volunteers are particularly readily enlisted from among the children of immigrants, former Wehrmacht officers, SS and Gestapo members and other war criminals

The Japanese "self defence forces" (this is how Japan's armed forces are now named) consist exclusively of mercenaries, mainly of peasants and of declassées. The military observer Hajime Takahashi wrote in this connection "Is it not that the command enlists the scum of the earth in the army because it wants to use them for criminal acts as mercenaries who are most reliable in moral respects?"

Thus, at present many imperialist armies consist fully or largely of professional mercenaries, who have lost or are rapidly losing all contacts with the masses For the sake of money and other privileges they are willing to kill not only "foreign", but also their own workers and peasants in the interest of the capitalists

The maintenance of the mercenaries is expensive and limits the possibility of training reserves But the imperialists deliberately do not want to teach military skills to the broad mass of the workers and peasants, especially those who actively participate in the class struggle, in progressive political organisations, in Left trade unions, etc For example, laws of some states contain a clause according to which persons who do not comply with political requirements are exempt from the service

Selection is particularly thorough for the special formations intended to suppress the revolutionary actions of the working masses, to carry out subversive actions and punitive measures against the population and guerillas in occupied territories The imperialists use the "experience" of nazi Germany, where SS units were set up for this purpose

The military police and gendarme units in the armies of the imperialist states enjoy special privileges, as do also

paratroops and marines They are the "fire brigades" intended to existinguish hotbeds of revolution

In the US armed forces, Special Forces, formed of emigrant scum, and the Marine Corps, numbering about 300,000 officers and men, are trained for punitive and subversive operations Each of the 13 divisions of Japan's "self defence" forces has special detachments for the "maintenance of public order" They have special weapons and are taught the tactics of "fighting rebels".

In the imperialist armies increasing attention is given to the class and political principle in selecting officers Prior to the Second World War the officers were mainly concerned with troop leadership, whereas now their duty, among other things, is to indoctrinate their subordinates with anti communism and nationalism, and to praise the "free world"

In the USA those joining the West Point, Annapolis and Colorado Springs Military Colleges must be recommended by the President or Vice President, a Congressman or the Secretary of Defence, Secretaries of the Army, Navy or Air Force Naturally, this practically bars the children of workers and small farmers from these colleges

It will be remembered that when the Bundeswehr was constituted the West German militarists spoke and wrote much about the "democratisation" of their armed forces What this democratisation really amounted to can be seen from the composition of the officer corps In 1962, six per cent were people of aristocratic descent, 80 per cent of bourgeois descent, 12 per cent were the sons of office workers and only 2 per cent of workers and peasants The "law on the rights of servicemen" enumerates a series of benefits that are granted to former servicemen of Hitler's Wehrmacht who become officers of the Bundeswehr At present the nucleus of the officer corps and of the NCOs in the Bundeswehr are former servicemen of the nazi army and SS men

The revanchist aspirations of the West German Bundeswehr are due also to the fact that about 50 per cent of the officers and candidates for officers are descendants of "migrants", that is, of people who before the Second World War lived on territories now forming the GDR or other socialist countries They maintain close links with revanchist "associations of fellow countrymen".

Substantial changes have taken place in the character of the training and education of the personnel in the imperialist armed forces The entire system for the ideological indoctrination of the personnel, the entire system of education and training, has assumed a clearly expressed aggressive, anti communist character

Reactionary and Aggressive Trends in the Training and Education of the Imperialist Armies

Before the First World War bourgeois nationalistic and chauvinistic as well as racialist and religious ideas were used to instil in the soldiers hostility towards other peoples After the victory of the socialist revolution in Russia and the revolutionary actions of the proletariat in a number of countries, slander against socialism and the USSR was pushed to the foreground of attention The education of the US and British armies in an anti Soviet spirit continued during the Second World War even though these armies were the allies of the Soviet Army in the war against nazi Germany and her accomplices

As we already mentioned, at present the indoctrination of the population and the armed forces is aimed at instil ling in them hatred for communism and for all progressive forces Anti communism and anti humanism are the alpha and omega of all indoctrination of the soldiers in the impe rialist armies They also permeate the training system In order to train privates and NCOs for the war against the USSR and other socialist countries, the ruling circles of the Western powers have created special bodies for the indoc trination in their armies. following the nazi example, and have considerably strengthened the responsibility of offi cers for the education of their subordinates The imperial ist armies are publishing a spate of anti communist litera ture, are sponsoring radio and TV broadcasts and produc ing films lauding capitalism and slandering socialism

Thus, according to the US Field Service Regulations commanders at all levels are responsible for the indoctrina tion of the personnel and for their morale A large propa ganda apparatus, the bodies for the "information and edu cation of the troops", is maintained for that purpose The administrative staff and the technical apparatus of these bodies in the Pentagon alone numbers hundreds of people The Departments of the Services have special information

boards In addition to managing propaganda activities they compile and publish teaching aids to be used for ideological indoctrination of the personnel, materials for the broad casting and press services, and produce propaganda films Some battalions, regiments and other units have "information officers".

The West German Bundeswehr has a "school for internal guidance" to train the officers and NCOs in charge of the "education" of soldiers

The troops are being actively "prepared" for fighting "internal" enemies The oath of allegiance taken by US soldiers (approved by Congress in 1962) contains the following "I do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic .." The former oath did not contain the last word

Great care is taken to diversify the forms of indoctrination, to make them actively influence the minds and hearts of the soldiers they range from debates, symposiums and conferences to cheap films and semi religious mystery plays in which the "servants of Satan" are dressed in the uniforms of Soviet officers and men

The imperialists encounter enormous difficulties in indoctrinating the personnel One of the reasons responsible for them is that in bourgeois society there are no positive ideas that could inspire the soldiers and sailors for heroic exploits, for the active and creative fulfilment of the tasks assigned to them This is the main reason for the lack of proper discipline among the soldiers, for the absence of initiative in combat and for the growth of crime in the armies of the imperialist states Money, the British military journal *Soldier* sadly admits, can buy everything except the soldiers' morale

Experience demonstrates that serious military trials tend to deteriorate the morale of mercenary troops This can be seen in particular from the growing number of deserters During the three years of the war in Korea tens of thousands of soldiers deserted from the US army Among the US troops fighting the "dirty war" in Vietnam desertions are assuming an alarming scale According to official US data, over 53.000 soldiers, that is, an equivalent of more than three divisions, deserted in 1968 alone

The low morale of the soldiers of imperialist armies evokes grave concern with the inspirers of military adventures and provocations The West German journal *Wehrkunde* described some of the factors which, in its opinion, tend to undermine the fighting spirit of the Bundeswehr soldiers and exercise a strong negative psychological and spiritual influence The journal enumerates the following factors "The division of the fatherland as a result of the collapse in 1945, the aftereffects of the shock received lasting for decades, the changes of government systems in the recent past the extreme distortion of the concept of democratic rights, the insufficiently developed sense of duty, the disappearance of the fatherland concept, the break up of traditions, the challenge flung by part of Germany's population. etc "[1]

In training their armed forces for a world war, the imperialists and their military theoreticians believe that the soldiers will blindly execute the aggressive plans of the monopoly bourgeoisie Military discipline, they say, will compel them to do this However, in the imperialist armies there is not and cannot be conscious discipline and the bourgeoisie therefore uses the "stick and carrot" method to make its soldiers obedient All sorts of special drills are introduced to work out blind discipline in the soldiers and sailors The officers attempt to make the men puppets, robots who behave automatically and thoughtlessly, instil in them fear of punishment for disobedience

Those engaging in progressive activities in the imperialist armies are subjected to brutal repressions For participation in political activities Japanese servicemen can be sentenced to hard labour and imprisonment for terms of up to three years The refusal to carry out an order to suppress strikes, disperse demonstrations, etc, is punishable with hard labour or imprisonment of up to five years

The "survival" theory used in the drilling and indoctrination of the soldiers also serves to work out blind obedience According to this theory soldiers must act in combat without thinking for whose sake they are to kill their opponent, in whose interests the war is waged and in whose interests they have to die on the field of battle

[1] *Wehrkunde*, No 3, March 1962, S 125

In the US and other imperialist armies a psychological fear of being captured is instilled during combat training Soldiers are constantly told that if taken prisoner by the Soviet Army they will be subjected to horrible torture To make this more convincing they are shown bogeys dressed in uniforms of officers and soldiers of the Soviet Army or the armies of other socialist states

Since the "psychology of the fight for life" cannot substitute for the absence of inspiring ideas, the imperialist armies strive hard to work out in their soldiers automatism in combat actions This is promoted by the material incentives granted to the mercenaries Material incentives for successes in combat training have also another aim to educate in the mercenary the willingness to carry out any order, no matter how inhuman. In the US army, for example, there is a system of increments to privates and NCOs "for proficiency".

To raise the morale of the army and to "make it immune against enemy propaganda" increments are given also for active participation in combat These increments are particularly high in the "special forces"

Such methods are used to imbue the men of the imperialist armies with the ideology and psychology of hired murderers who do not care with whom the guilt for the war lies and in whose interests it is fought. These attitudes have taken root among the US servicemen fighting the dirty war in Vietnam and found expression in the unheard of atrocities and acts of violence perpetrated against the population of this freedom loving country The incontestable information about the mass murders by US soldiers of hundreds and thousands of Vietnamese children, women and old people have given short shrift to the legend that US soldiers in foreign countries "defend democracy and the free way of life".

Thus, a whole system of measures is used by the imperialist bourgeoisie to make their armed forces an obedient tool in the struggle against socialism, the national liberation and revolutionary movement

Yet, in spite of all that the imperialist military political leaders can do nothing to stop a deterioration of morale in the ranks during unjust, annexationist wars

Thus, to wage the comparatively small unjust war in

Vietnam there were not enough volunteers in the USA and the government had to recruit men in accordance with the Selected Service Act The indignation against the escalation of the war was expressed in mass draft evasions by the young According to the US Department for Selective Service Administration there were 13,500 draft dodgers in September 1966, and over 1,000 persons had been imprisoned

The great losses suffered by the US forces and their inability to win a victory over the Vietnamese people made officers and men, who had formerly supported the aggression, rethink their positions Thus, sergeant Jackson, who was on duty guarding US Defence Minister McNamara, during his inspection trip to Vietnam in October 1966, told a correspondent of the *New York Post* "I wanted to speak right up and tell him the boys are ready to go home I wanted to ask him can't he do anything to get us out of here any faster If the answer is withdraw, then let's go get out We're not accomplishing anything here "[1]

Aggressive Essence of the Military Political Imperialist Blocs

The reactionary role of the modern imperialist military machine is clearly expressed in the aggressive military political blocs They were set up by the US imperialists with the aim of securing world domination, of suppressing the revolutionary forces in the capitalist and newly free countries, and of mobilising the material resources of international reaction for a war against the world socialist system.

The anti communist orientation of the military blocs attracted the reactionary classes of a number of European and Asian capitalist states Despite the opposition of the masses, their governments joined these blocs in keeping with US demands

The greatest threat to peace comes from the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) set up in 1949. At first 12 states joined NATO. the USA, Great Britain, Canada, France,[2] Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, Denmark, Portugal, Iceland and Luxemburg In 1952, under

[1] *New Times*, No 43, 1966, Moscow, p 8

[2] France withdrew from NATO's military organisation in 1966, but remained in its political committee.

pressure from the USA, Greece and Turkey joined NATO Three years later West Germany joined the bloc

In 1954, after the failure of the US aggression in Korea and the defeat of the French colonialists in Vietnam, the governments of the USA, Great Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, the Philippines and Pakistan set up the South East Asian Treaty Organisation (SEATO)

In November 1955 the Central Treaty Organisation (CENTO) was set up Up to 1959 this bloc was called the Baghdad Pact, but after the July 1958 events Iraq left the bloc, and Great Britain, Turkey, Pakistan and Iran had to look hurriedly for a new name Formally the USA is not in CENTO, but actually it plays the main role in this and other blocs

In addition to the above the imperialists have set up such military political blocs as ANZUS, the Western European Union and ASPAC, which consist mainly of the countries participating in NATO, CENTO and SEATO Other blocs (OAS, ODECA) incorporate countries whose governments under pressure from the USA pool their efforts in the strug gle against the Latin American peoples who are fighting for their national and social liberation

In setting up military blocs the US imperialists relied on the experience of the notorious Anti Comintern Pact signed on the eve of the Second World War by Germany, Italy and Japan

At the same time the military political alliances of today attach certain specific features NATO gave the US impe rialists the "legal" chance to install its agents in the armed forces of its NATO allies, to prepare and carry out military fascist coups (similar to the one carried out in Greece in 1967, and those which but for the decisive action by the dem ocratic forces would have been carried out in France in 1961, and in Italy in 1964)

NATO is not simply a treaty between the governments of the main imperialist powers on joint action, but is a mil itary political organisation commanding huge armed forc es, equipped with modern weapons, including nuclear mis siles The NATO joint command can independently decide to unleash a world war under the pretext of having to "re pel sudden aggression", it can intervene in the internal af fairs of the member countries in order to suppress demo

cratic and revolutionary movements in them The leading role in the NATO joint military command belongs to US generals

The governments of the countries in the imperialist blocs have signed treaties providing for the use of allied armed forces in the struggle against revolutionary actions in any of the member countries of NATO, CENTO, SEATO and other blocs The mercenaries of the US Army and Navy, the West German revanchists and former nazis now serving in the Bundeswehr have turned out to be the best suited tools for the implementation of this task This explains, in particular, the stationing of US and West German troops in several West European countries These troops are a sort of "foreign legion", a "police baton" in the hands of the reactionary forces The US Field Service Regulations openly say that "land forces in oversea areas are .. a means by which the United States can assist its allies to deal with disorders inspired and directed by hostile states" [1]

The armed forces of the CENTO and SEATO member countries are not placed at the disposal of the blocs, but there are agreements on introducing armed forces to the territory of an "allied" country in order to render it "aid" in the suppression of democratic movements For example, a special commission has been set up by CENTO for the struggle against "subversive activity" The participants of the 6th Session of SEATO held in 1960 openly declared that they were willing to use their troops as police forces to fight the revolutionary movement in Southeast Asia

Many of the countries participating in the aggressive blocs, especially economically backward ones, are unable to carry the enormous military burden This produces counteraction not only on the part of the masses but also on the part of some of the ruling circles They cannot ignore the difficult position of their countries For example, the armed forces of Turkey incorporated in NATO swallow up a large portion of that country's national income Large sums of money are spent by Iran, Pakistan, Greece and Thailand to maintain their armies The peoples of Taiwan and South Korea are in an even more difficult position South Korea

[1] *Field Service Regulations*, p 12

and Taiwan do not formally belong to any military blocs, but their puppet governments are, at the demand of the USA and with its assistance, preparing for aggression against the socialist countries and are maintaining huge armed forces South Korea 600,000 men and Taiwan 550,000 (the island has only 11 5 million inhabitants)

The unity of NATO and other blocs is eroded by economic rivalry and national contradictions The armed forces of many members of these blocs are dissatisfied with the US domination

Under the pressure of the masses the governments of some member states of the aggressive blocs refuse to send their troops to suppress the liberation struggle of the peoples of other countries, refuse to have missile bases of the imperialist powers in their countries Despite the strong pressure by the USA, no NATO member has sent its troops to participate in the US aggression in Vietnam The leaders of a number of NATO countries speak of the need to stop the war in Vietnam, and the French government has openly condemned US aggression

The peoples of the countries in the imperialist blocs grow increasingly aware that the US imperialists are ready to destroy their "allies" during the war. Thus, the TASS statement of August 19, 1961 revealed CENTO's secret plan on preparations to explode 40 nuclear land mines in Iran

The withdrawal of France from the NATO military organisation, the removal from France of the leading bodies of that bloc, the statements of the governments of Britain and Belgium that they intended to decrease their share in NATO commitments, the opposition of the governments of Iran and Pakistan against the US domination in CENTO and SEATO these are but some of the phenomena showing that the contradictions in the imperialist blocs have entered a new stage The crises in these blocs are periodically recurring At present the imperialist blocs are bursting at the seams because of the intensification of contradictions between their members

The organic faults and deep contradictions endemic in the capitalist system and the armed forces of the imperialist states must be taken into account At the same time it would be dangerous to belittle the possibilities of the im

perialist armed forces These armies are numerous, equip ped with the latest weapons, united by a single command, and have been indoctrinated to wage aggressive wars

Constant Threat to Peace by Imperialist Armies and Military Blocs

For the first time in their history the imperialist states are building up and dislocating their armed forces in keep ing with the general interests of inter national imperialism as well as with their own interests The groupings of these states express the aggressive essence of modern militarism

The US imperialists have set up numerous military bases in the USA, Britain, Italy, North Africa, Greenland and the Pacific Ocean The imperialists call them defensive bases Actually, however, they are springboards of aggres sion The building of nuclear submarines is being stepped up According to the Pentagon, the Navy is to have com mand over 50 per cent of the US nuclear potential.

The US armed forces, notably their Navy and Air Force, are located so as to be able with the men and means at their command to wage a war against the USSR and other socialist countries and to suppress national liberation move ments in Asia, Africa and Latin America After the adop tion of the "flexible response" strategy, the armaments, organisation and location of the US armed forces have considerably changed with a view to enabling them to conduct military operations with or without nuclear weap ons

The US ruling circles assign the following tasks to their Navy to ward off, as effectively as possible, retaliatory nuclear missiles strikes from US territory, to ensure the survival of part of the bases and nuclear delivery means for subsequent nuclear strikes, to preserve these bases along the perimetre of the world socialist system in the event of a forced evacuation of land bases from the European, Asian and African countries, to exert pressure on US allies outside the Western hemisphere, to carry out police functions in the struggle against the national liberation and revolution ary movement on other continents; to safeguard the trans portation of troops and military cargoes from the USA to overseas theatres of operations

The US naval forces have been stationed in keeping with these tasks Atomic submarines armed with nuclear missiles

are constantly patrolling the Northeast Atlantic Ocean and the Mediterranean, ready to strike a nuclear blow The 7th Fleet, the strongest US naval arm, is patrolling off the coast of the Soviet Far East and the Southeast Asian countries Warships of the 6th Fleet give the greatest attention to the Mediterranean waters Part of the 1st Fleet in the Pacific Ocean is also poised against the socialist countries

The plans to set up NATO multilateral nuclear forces, which some of the US ruling circles are actively promoting, is a major threat to peace.

The imperialists of the USA and other countries frequently use their satellites and gangs of mercenaries to start and conduct wars against progressive states and movements, and to restore colonial oppression A case in point was the Israeli aggression against the Arab peoples in 1967, which was prepared and inspired by US, British and West German imperialism.

All this compels the peace loving peoples not to relax their vigilance

3 THE ARMED FORCES OF THE YOUNG NATIONAL STATES

The basic contradiction of the contemporary epoch has a major influence on the development of the newly independent states and their armies Under its impact, and especially under the influence of the world socialist system, the social forces in the young independent states are polarising Their armies too are developing under this influence The progressive patriotic forces in the developing countries are realising ever more clearly that only by embarking on socialist construction can they quickly achieve a high development of their productive forces, secure political and economic independence, and a rapid growth of the material welfare and culture of their people They therefore strive to strengthen the political and economic relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries on the basis of sovereignty and mutual advantage *The world socialist system gives the young states that have embarked on progressive development diversified assistance, including assistance in the strengthening of their defensive capacity, and in the development of their armed forces*

The imperialist powers, conversely, strive to turn the young states and their armed forces into instruments of the neo colonialists Among the forms used to implement neo colonialist policies are "aid" to the young states by supply ing them with weapons and military equipment, the sending of "instructors", the bribery of officers in their armies, the maintenance of military bases and garrisons on their terri tories, etc

Neo colonialist policies are dangerous not only for the people of the countries in which they are pursued, but also for those of other peace loving countries The mili tary provocations of the puppet and dependent states may have dangerous consequences for the cause of peace throughout the world

Armies Born During the Struggle for National Liberation. Specifics of Their Formation

How did the young independent states create their armed forces? In countries which by the end of the Sec ond World War already had revo lutionary parties to head the struggle of the working masses for national and social liberation, the armed forces were built up under their leadership The parties of the working class took charge of the development and education of the army, and of its combat actions In their turn, the armed forces acted as a major motive force in transforming the na tional liberation, democratic revolution into a socialist one

In some countries the Communists formed a united front with other parties waging the national liberation struggle Directly participating in the armed struggle, the Commu nists carried on educational work among the military units and the working masses, organised support for combat ac tions by strikes and working people's demonstrations The unfolding national liberation struggle, the anti imperialist revolution was simultaneously a process of the formation and development of people's armies This is how the Na tional People's Army of Algeria, the Burmese Army and the Army of the National Liberation Front of South Viet nam were created

The strength of the National People's Army of Algeria, as also that of other people's revolutionary armies, is found ed on its moral political superiority, the selfless support

given to it by the Algerian people and the working masses of other Arab countries, and by the world socialist system At the same time the accelerated process of the demarcation of the class forces and the growth of revolutionary consciousness among the working class and all working people changed the National Liberation Army (The attempts of some bourgeois officers and former leaders of the National Liberation Front to carry out counter revolutionary coups in 1962 1964 in order to preserve capitalism in the country were foiled by the working masses and the Algerian Army)

The Burmese Army is an active force promoting the development of that country along the non capitalist road It was created and developed in the course of the long national liberation struggle against Japanese and British imperialists waged jointly by *revolutionary democrats and Communists* Its soldiers are educated in the spirit of patriotism, constant readiness to defend the people's gains against internal reactionaries and imperialist aggressors The officer corps of the Burmese Army consists mainly of representatives of the medium urban layers, the rank and file mostly of working peasants The Burmese Army participates actively in the political and economic life of the country, in realising the "Burma's Road to Socialism" programme Reactionary officers, who supported neo colonialist policies, were ousted from the army in the course of revolutionary reforms Patriotically minded officers hold leading posts in all the links of the state apparatus

The transformation of the national liberation armies into an active force for social reform is a logical modern development This process proceeds the quicker, the more actively the masses participate in the struggle against colonialism Convincing proof of this is the development of the armies in countries of Indochina, and also of the armies of several African and Middle East countries

Rebel armies are born in the course of the armed struggle the peoples of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea Bissau, Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa are waging against the colonialists, against fascist and racialist regimes Despite the difficulty of the struggle against the superior forces of the enemy and the splitting tactics of various adventurist

groups and organisations, the revolutionary armed forces increasingly win the support of the masses and of the pro gressive forces the world over Experience demonstrates that the armed struggle imposed upon the working people by the colonialists and corrupt regimes inevitably becomes a school in which the people learn the art of revolution It convinces them of the need to conduct not only a struggle for national liberation, but also to carry out fundamental social reforms on the liberated territory

Many colonies have won political independence without a drawn out armed struggle The colonialists "granted" them independence in order to be able to place puppet govern ments at their head and to preserve their economic posi tions

In these countries armies were built up either on the basis of the old "national structure", or were organised anew, in keeping with the social and political nature of the state

In some countries army units led by progressive officers overthrew the reactionary puppet regimes and as a result these countries have embarked on democratic socio politi cal reforms This happened in Egypt in 1952, in Iraq in 1958, in the Yemen in 1962 and in Libya in 1969 In Syria in 1965 army units supported the actions of the working masses headed by the trade unions and progressive political parties As a result the military dictatorship was overthrown and the road was cleared for the implementation of impor tant socio economic reforms

In the young national states the attitude of the army to progressive reforms and its combat efficiency in the anti imperialist struggle depend greatly on the social composi tion and the political stand of the officer corps

Though they were well supplied with modern weapons, the armed forces of the UAR suffered a military setback in the war against the Israeli aggressors in June 1967 mainly because a large part of the generals and officers, who were linked with the feudals and hence were reactionary, did not want to defend the progressive changes in the republic Later they took part in an anti government plot Supported by the masses, the UAR government discharged hundreds of such officers and generals from the services in June August 1967 and advanced representatives of the progres sive forces to these posts The Arab Socialist Union is con

ducting political education in the army and works to weld together its personnel

The replacement of disloyal officers by representatives of the progressive forces and the intensification of the activity of revolutionary organisations in the army are also underway in some other countries which have embarked on non capitalist development

The imperialists attempt to subject the armies of the young national states to their influence They do this through their "instructors" sent to teach the troops to handle the weapons and equipment bought from the Western powers, by bribing officers, organising coups, etc In some African countries military coups have put reactionary officers in power In most cases these coups were inspired by the imperialist states with a view to overthrowing governments that had embarked on non capitalist development (Ghana, for example) or to prevent the country's advance towards political and economic independence The seizure of power in a number of African and Latin American countries by reactionary military juntas naturally cannot resolve the social contradictions in those countries On the contrary, these contradictions further aggravate under neo colonialist regimes, and the struggle against the rule of domestic and foreign reactionaries takes on the sharpest forms

The specific features of the contradictions and of the ways for resolving them in individual countries attaining sovereignty were responsible for the specific character and principles underlying the development of their armed forces

The development of India's national armed forces proceeded in a very specific way Britain formed units in India, manned partly by Indians, for the purpose of suppressing the peoples of India and other countries, and also to fight Britain's competitors Several armament plants were built in the country During the Second World War the Indian volunteer army was increased to 2 5 million Over 75,000 Indian soldiers and NCOs joined the people in the struggle for national independence After the Second World War, the British colonialists were compelled to grant India independence, but did this on condition that the country would be divided into two states India and Pakistan India's

armed forces were also divided The men were divided mainly on the basis of religion

Having proclaimed a policy of non alignment with aggressive imperialist blocs, the Indian government discharged British officers from its army At the same time it began to build a national war industry The Soviet Union did much to help India maintain her independence In addition to the regular army, India has territorial troops, a national and auxiliary cadet corps

Officially no class limitations exist for those wishing to join officer schools Actually, however, applicants are required to have a school leaving certificate, a substantial sum of money to buy equipment and also some pocket money These conditions keep children of the working people out of the schools The men (sepoys) and NCOs are hired, generally for long terms

Alongside with the just struggle for the liberation of India from the colonialists, the Indian Army was used to suppress the action of starved peasants against the feudal lords

The bourgeois governments of some independent states deliberately oppose the democratisation of the officer corps wishing thus to retain the army in their hands and to use it for their reactionary purposes However, the growing role of the army in social transformations and in the struggle against neo colonialism, the advance in military equipment, the comprehensive specialisation and growth of the importance of engineering and technical personnel have opened the officer corps also to descendants of the people's intelligentsia, of the working people The growing influence of democratic and socialist ideas among young officers and the mass of men is a logical development, especially in the young national states, whose peoples are growing aware that only the development along the non capitalist road and reliance on the world socialist system will enable their countries to overcome backwardness and dependence

Armies headed by representatives of the imperialist states pose a serious threat to the independence of their own country and to that of its neighbours The armies of the young states in the aggressive blocs, of most Latin American and some African countries have to all intents become "foreign legions" of the Western powers instruments of

imperialism for the suppression of the national liberation movement in their own and in neighbouring countries

The rapid growth of the national liberation movement and the class struggle in the young national states will inevitably spur the development of the patriotic forces in the armies of those states, will sharpen the contradiction between the progressive, revolutionary forces and the reactionary, counter revolutionary forces in them The heightening of the role and influence of the progressive, revolutionary forces is an objective historical trend, one that asserts itself also in the armies of the young national states

* * *

Whenever the oppressed classes rose to fight their exploiters, they always tried to set up revolutionary military organisations of their own to oppose the armies of the exploiter states However, neither the slaves nor the peasant masses fighting their oppressors were sufficiently well organised They lacked the necessary staunchness and had no clear idea of their revolutionary liberation aims Also, they lacked reliable political leadership, without which no struggle against the class enemy can be successful It was only when the proletariat became an independent political power and the world socialist system had formed that the exploited classes of the colonial and dependent countries acquired a reliable leader in their struggle for liberation from all forms of national and social oppression

The victory in Russia of the first socialist revolution in the world, and the formation of the world socialist system led to the collapse of the colonial system of imperialism, and gave the people who had freed themselves from colonial oppression a real chance to embark on the building of socialism, by passing the capitalist stage In their struggle for the non capitalist road of development and the transition to socialism these peoples rely on the comprehensive assistance of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, including also their help in setting up and developing their national armed forces and in organising the armed defence of their countries against imperialist aggressors The Soviet Government has repeatedly declared that it has al

ways given and continues to give various assistance to peo ples fighting against imperialist intervention in their affairs, and will assist victims of imperialist aggression by all, in cluding military, means

In modern conditions, when the relation of forces in the world continues to change in favour of peace, democracy and socialism, while imperialism intensifies its aggressive ventures, the defensive might of the USSR and other so cialist countries, the combat efficiency and readiness of their armed forces are a most important factor in securing his torical progress

Chapter Five

THE ARMED FORCES OF THE SOCIALIST STATES

The question of the military organisation of the victori ous proletariat holds an important place in Marxism Lenin ism, and is part of the teaching on war and the army This question is so important because it concerns the main weap on for the defence of the achievements of socialism against encroachments by international imperialist reaction, that is, the armed forces of the socialist state

1 SOCIAL NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE ARMY OF A SOCIALIST STATE

The armies of socialist countries differ radically from the armies of exploiter states as regards their social nature, historical purpose and moral make up They are brought into being by specific conditions and their development is governed by specific laws, which differ qualitatively from the ones governing the development of bourgeois armies

Historical Purpose of the Armies of Socialist States

The laws governing the proletariat's class struggle against the bourgeoisie require that the socialist state should form armed forces It is compelled to do so by the exploiter classes The latter are the first to re sort to armed violence against the working people There fore, in order to consolidate their power, to uphold their revolutionary gains and to defend the socialist country, the working class has to create powerful armed forces "If the ruling class, the proletariat," Lenin said, "wants to hold

power, it must, therefore, prove its ability to do so by its military organisation "[1]

In the transition period from capitalism to socialism, especially immediately after the seizure of power by the proletariat, world imperialist reaction endeavours to stifle the socialist revolution by force It supports and directs the resistance of internal counter revolutionaries, organises armed actions against the power of the workers and peasants and supports counter revolutionary troops when foreign interventionists invade the country The function of armed defence of the socialist country against attacks from the outside, one of the basic functions of the workers' and peasants' state, merges with the function of suppressing armed resistance of the overthrown exploiters

This function could have been carried out successfully by the socialist militia, if the internal counter revolutionaries had not been helped by the armed forces of the imperialist powers But the alliance of external and internal reaction for the purpose of restoring capitalism in the country makes it necessary to set up a regular, standing army It has the functions of suppressing the armed resistance of the overthrown exploiter classes and of defending the country against the military attacks of international imperialism

Externally the first function resembles the corresponding function of the armies of the capitalist state, but differs fundamentally from it in essence The army of the exploiter state is used to suppress actions by the working people The army of the socialist state suppresses insurrections of the exploiters, of the "rebellious slave owners" to use Lenin's words, and defends the revolutionary gains of the people

The way in which this function is discharged depends on the conditions under which the socialist revolution is carried out, it may take the form of a war against the overthrown classes and foreign interventionists, or else of measures to prevent the outbreak of a civil war by foiling counter revolutionary plots and rebellions, and by defeating armed counter revolutionary gangs

The victory of socialism in the USSR put an end to the function of the Soviet Armed Forces having to do with the suppression of the resistance of exploiters in the country by

[1] V I Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol 29, p 153

military means, and the army now has the sole purpose of defending the socialist country against attacks by imperialist aggressors

"In terms of internal conditions," the Programme of the CPSU says, "the Soviet Union needs no army But since the danger of war coming from the imperialist camp persists, and since complete and general disarmament has not been achieved, the CPSU considers it necessary to maintain the defensive power of the Soviet state and the combat preparedness of its Armed Forces at a level ensuring the decisive and complete defeat of any enemy who dares to encroach upon the Soviet land "[1]

At the present stage the Soviet Armed Forces are developing their external function, that of defending the socialist motherland, the entire socialist community They fulfil this task in alliance with the armies of the fraternal socialist countries

By defending the achievements in the building of socialism and communism, the freedom and independence of the socialist countries, the armed forces of the socialist states simultaneously defend universal peace They did this in the past, but in modern conditions they are able to do it much more effectively The armed forces of the socialist countries are a major factor for universal peace The further strengthening of their might and the increase in their combat readiness accord with the interests of all of humanity

Thus, *the setting up of powerful armed forces of a new type, capable of opposing the armies of the imperialist states, is a concrete expression of one of the general laws of the transition from capitalism to socialism and communism in conditions of the existence of two opposing social systems, the law of the armed defence of the gains of the socialist revolution*

Main Distinguishing Features of the Armies of Socialist States

A comprehensive characteristic of the social nature and distinguishing features of the Soviet Army and Navy is given in Lenin's works, the decisions of Party Congresses and other Party documents

In the course of their development the Armed Forces of the USSR have passed through two main stages The

[1] *The Road to Communism*, Moscow, p 55

first stage, during which they were an instrument of the socialist state, of the proletarian dictatorship, ends with the complete and final triumph of socialism in the country During the present second stage, the Armed Forces are an instrument of the socialist state of the whole people These stages correspond to the character of the socio economic and political relations dominant during these periods in the history of the Soviet people At the same time they reflect the radical changes in the relation of forces in the world in favour of peace, democracy and socialism

The armies that have emerged and developed in other socialist countries have common features with the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union The most important of them stem from the nature of socialism and are connected with concrete historical conditions These features make armed forces of socialist countries differ radically from the armies of imperialist states

The armies of the socialist countries are armies of a new type. As regards their character and socio political essence they are fully determined by the nature of the socialist system, are samples of it *All these armies are organs of the socialist state, and the Marxist Leninist Parties are their leading, guiding and organising force.* Irrespective of the level of their development, these armies are based upon social relations and states of the same type, are guided by the same Marxist Leninist ideology

One of the most important specific features of the socialist armies, distinguishing them from bourgeois armed forces, is that they are genuinely people's armies. They defend the interests of the workers and peasants, of all working people, they are indissolubly linked with the people, uphold the great achievements of socialism, and are an embodiment of the alliance between the working class and the working peasantry, of the social, political and ideological unity of socialist society

The genuinely popular character of the army of the socialist state is expressed, first, in its purpose, in the functions it fulfils, second. in the unity of the army and the people, third, in its social make up and in the relations between men and officers

The armed forces of the socialist countries defend the vital interests of the working people Therefore, the inter

relations between the army and the people in socialist society differ fundamentally from those in capitalist countries. In socialist countries the people love their army. The Soviet Army, Lenin said, is "an armed force of workers and peasants, and this force is not divorced from people, as was the old standing army, but is very closely bound up with the people".[1]

The unity of the army and the people is expressed in many forms. The people give every assistance to their army in its struggle against enemies, supply it with first class weapons and equipment, with everything it needs. The army is boundlessly devoted to its people and heroically fights for their freedom and happiness. The army and the people stand ideologically and politically united. This is, in fact, the source of its strength and invincibility.

In bourgeois armies there exists a social division between the officers and the rank and file, while the armies of socialist states are monolythic. All officers and men are working people; they have identical interests and the relations between them are therefore founded on mutual understanding and mutual respect. They express the co-operation and mutual assistance, democratism and humanism, typical of socialist society.

The change in the social make-up of the armies of socialist states and their gradual transformation into armies of the whole people are a law of their development.

A distinguishing feature of armies of the socialist states is that they are armies of friendship and brotherhood between peoples defending the freedom and independence of the socialist nations who have united in a single socialist community.

In exploiter states the armies are an instrument of national oppression and are educated in a spirit of great power chauvinism, haughtiness, conceit and contempt for oppressed nations. The armies of the world socialist system, on the other hand, are animated by a spirit of equality and freedom of all nations and nationalities. Educated in the spirit of friendship and brotherhood between nations, the armies of the socialist countries selflessly protect the freedom and state sovereignty of the peoples living in these

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 103.

countries, defend the frontiers of their motherlands This is one of the sources of their might.

The Soviet Armed Forces are an example of armed forces built on the principle of equality and friendship between peoples They are multinational and rely on the cohesion of the working people of all nationalities united in a single military organisation The Soviet Army and Navy, therefore, have the full support of all nations and nationalities in the country This was one of the reasons why the Soviet Armed Forces displayed such amazing strength and staunchness in the Great Patriotic War

The friendship of the peoples of the socialist country and its embodiment in the army are one of the manifestations of socialist internationalism, on which the development and life of the armed forces are built (The new type of international relations between the states of the world socialist system is reflected in the armed forces too *The new distinctive feature of socialist armies, one developed as a result of the formation of the world socialist system, is that they are armies of friendship between the peoples of all socialist countries, that they are permeated with the spirit of socialist internationalism, are built and develop on the basis of close cooperation and fraternal mutual assistance.* Relying on economic, socio political and ideological principles of the same type, the socialist states consistently strengthen the friendship, co operation and fraternal mutual assistance among themselves in the economic, political and cultural fields, and in the military defence of their countries)

"The Soviet Union sees it as its internationalist duty," the Programme of the CPSU says, "to guarantee, together with the other socialist countries, the reliable defence and security of the entire socialist camp "[1]

The military political co operation of the states of the socialist community, their mutual assistance in the development of the armed forces assume different forms Chief among them are the commitment to help each other in repelling imperialist aggression, in accordance with the Warsaw Treaty and the bilateral treaties on friendship, co operation and mutual assistance signed between the socialist countries, the consultation and co ordination of measures

[1] *The Road to Communism*, p 557

aimed at strengthening the armed forces and their defensive capacity, the setting up of a joint command for the troops set apart by the Warsaw Treaty member states, the carrying out of joint manoeuvres, the exchange of experience in military training and political education, the training of officers, etc

Of great importance to further strengthening the co operation and mutual assistance between the armies of the socialist countries is the systematic education of the soldiers in the spirit of socialist internationalism and patriotism, the promotion of the lofty traditions born in the joint struggle of the peoples and their armed forces against foreign in vaders

The consolidation of the socialist states and their armies dooms to failure the imperialist attempts to disunite the socialist countries, to weaken their might and smash them one by one. The Soviet Armed Forces and the armies of other fraternal socialist states are always ready to come to each other's assistance in case of a military attack and pro vocations by the imperialists

The distinctive feature of the armies of the socialist states is that they are educated to respect the peoples of all other, non socialist countries, to be aware of their interna tionalist duty to the working class and the working people of the world, to render fraternal assistance to the people fighting for the liberation from class and national oppres sion In this respect they also differ fundamentally from the armies of the capitalist states which are educated to hate the peoples of other countries, are imbued with nationalism and racialism

The armies of the socialist countries fulfil their interna tionalist duty by various means and in diverse forms First, they selflessly defend the gains of socialism in their own countries and thereby defend the cause of socialism in the whole world Second, the heavy defeats these armies inflict upon aggressors during the war weaken the strength of im perialism and facilitate the people's struggle against op pression Third, under definite conditions the armed forces of the socialist countries give direct military assistance to countries falling victim to imperialist aggression Fourth, they defend universal peace by creating a powerful obstacle to military adventures by the imperialists

The Soviet Army repeatedly routed the armies of aggressors, thereby weakening the forces of reaction, their onslaught on the liberation movement of the working people and the oppressed peoples, defended the cause of socialism, progress and peace Emphasising the international significance of Russia's working people's heroic struggle against international imperialism, Lenin said that they represent and defend the interests of world socialism.

The armies of the socialist states are liberation armies, they waged and can wage only just wars History has assigned to them the great mission of being the bulwark of socialism, democracy and peace in the whole world These features of the socialist armies find a generalised expression in their spiritual make up, in their moral and political supremacy over bourgeois armies Ideological conviction and communist morality make the Soviet soldier great and gallant, are the source of his inspired feats in training and in battle, the source of his selfless service to his people, to his country, and to the cause of communism

Moral Political Make up of the Armies of Socialist States

The moral political make up of the armies of socialist countries is distinguished by noble and lofty traits, which reflect the new relations between the members of socialist society and embody the ideas of Marxism Leninism, the norms of communist morality.

The high consciousness of the soldiers is a distinctive feature of the armies of socialist states. "... For the first time in world history," Lenin said, "an army, an armed force, has been created, which knows what it is fighting for, and, for the first time in world history, workers and peasants are making incredible sacrifices in the knowledge that they are defending the Soviet Socialist Republic, the rule of the working people . ."[1] Lenin repeatedly stressed that the Soviet Army is strong by the consciousness of its commanders and rank and file, that every one of them knows "what he is fighting for and is ready to shed his own blood for the triumph of justice and socialism"[2]

The socialist social relations, the new social nature of the whole of society and of the state, form the objective basis

[1] V I Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol 29, p 221
[2] *Ibid*, Vol 31, p 137

of the high consciousness of the soldiers The consistent educational work of the Communist and Workers' Parties and the invincible strength of the ideas of Marxism Lenin ism which capture the minds of the working people owing to the great truth and justness contained in them, are powerful factors promoting the growth of the soldiers' con sciousness

Distinctive features of the moral and political make up of the officers and men of socialist armies are their deep awareness of their social and military duty, the sense of responsibility for the combat readiness of sub units, units, formations and the whole of the armed forces, high vigilance, a statesman like approach to the defence of the socialist country

An important feature in the spiritual make up of the soldiers of socialist armies are collectivism and comradely mutual assistance according to the principle "one for all, all for one" A striking manifestation of this feature is com radeship in arms, mutual assistance in combat, assistance to comrades experiencing difficulties in private matters or in their service activities

As distinct from the individualism and egoism reigning in the bourgeois armies, the soldiers of the socialist armies place social interests and aspirations above all, care for their collective, for its successes, honour and glory They understand that only in a friendly collective (sub unit, unit or formation) can the personal capacities of every soldier manifest themselves to the fullest and be of greatest use to the country.

A feature typical of the moral and political make up of the armies of socialist states is humanism in the relations between the servicemen and the civilian population

As distinct from the imperialist armies, where servicemen often treat the civilian population roughly, where violence and robbery are frequent, the standard of conduct of the sol diers of socialist countries is a polite, comradely attitude towards the civilian population, assistance to it in fighting natural calamities, aid in economic and socio political campaigns, strict observance of the inviolability of people's property and houses, readiness to save children, women and the aged from any danger, respect for human dignity, the rights and customs of the population of countries which the

troops of socialist states have to enter in the course of military operations or the fulfilment of their allied commitments

The standards of communist morality, the standards of conduct of servicemen are set forth in the laws and the military regulations, they lay down rules for the treatment of prisoners of war, prohibit their being subjected to humiliation, demand that they be treated humanely and that the wounded be given medical aid

The behaviour of the soldiers of socialist armies noted above expresses the genuinely humane nature and purpose of these armies They are a weapon for the defence of socialist gains, of the freedom of the socialist nations from exploitation and all forms of social and political oppression, of the broad opportunities for the all round development of the individual offered by socialism, a weapon defending the independence and sovereignty of the socialist nations The liberating mission of the armies of socialist states with respect to the peoples enslaved by imperialism is a manifestation of their genuine humanism

Socialist humanism is imbued in the soldiers by their education in the spirit of proletarian internationalism and esprit de corps The ideological work of the Communist and Workers' Parties in the armed forces is focussed on this At the same time all manifestations of nationalism and national narrow mindedness and other vestiges of the past are energetically combatted

As distinct from the armies of the imperialist states, where the philistine bourgeois morality is combined with the unbridled propaganda of amorality, the cult of violence and misanthropy, in the armies of the socialist countries soldiers are educated in the spirit of noble communist moral principles Such features of communist morality as the conscientious attitude towards military duties and the social wealth (military property), honesty and truthfulness, moral purity and modesty in social and private life, justness with respect to all comrades, superior and inferior in rank, are penetrating ever deeper into the soldiers' consciousness and are becoming standards of behaviour

The decisive features of the spiritual make up of the socialist armies are such political and moral attitudes in the soldiers as devotion to the homeland and hatred for the enemy, courage, bravery and fearlessness in the struggle for

the interests of the country These features found expression in the heroic exploits of millions of Soviet soldiers in two patriotic wars and in other armed conflicts with aggressors, innumerable examples of conscious self sacrifice by all soldiers, from generals down to the rank and file in the name of the victory over the enemies

These features, displayed also by soldiers of other socialist countries, are revealed not only on the fields of battle, and not only in times of war, but also in peace time Let us remember the numerous examples of courage shown by the engineers who rendered harmless ammunition dumps left behind by the nazi invaders, that of the border guards, of the soldiers in the rocket troops, of the pilots and sailors safeguarding the country's frontiers and air space Example of the valiant courage, the heroism of the Soviet people are the flights of the Soviet cosmonauts who were the first to blaze the road to the stars

The superiority of the moral and political make up of the socialist armies is one of the sources of their might and invincible strength.

2 FOUNDATIONS AND PRINCIPLES UNDERLYING THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOVIET ARMED FORCES

The working masses, the Communist and Workers' Parties of countries embarking on the road of socialism and creating their own armies have been drawing on the experience gained by the Soviet Union in the development of its Armed Forces The question of the basic principles underlying the development of the Soviet Armed Forces is therefore of major interest and pressing importance for all countries of the world socialist system and for the states which have embarked on the non capitalist road of development

Correlation of the Foundations and Principles of the Armed Forces Development

The organisation and development of the Soviet Armed Forces is directly bound up with the nature of the socialist state

The objective socio economic and political foundations of the development of the Armed Forces are the Soviet socialist social and state systems, the alliance between the working class and

the peasantry, the socio political and ideological unity of society, the unity and friendship of the Soviet peoples *The material, technical and economic foundation* of the might of the Soviet Armed Forces is the socialist economy, notably heavy industry, transport, communications, and socialist agriculture

The ideological and theoretical foundation of the devel opment of the Soviet Armed Forces is Marxism Leninism and its teaching on war and the army, the communist ideology, which is the only ideology in the country

By its leadership, organisational and ideological work the Communist Party guides the development of the economic and socio political foundations so as to ensure the strengthening of the defensive might of the Soviet state, the might of the Soviet Armed Forces This is promoted also by the use of the Marxist Leninist teaching in the development of the Armed Forces, by the education of the Armed Forces personnel in the spirit of its noble ideas *The leadership by the Communist Party of the Armed Forces is the fundamental basis underlying Soviet military development*

While the concept "*foundations*" answers the question of *what* determines the social nature and purpose of the armed forces of a socialist state, the concept "*principles*" answers the question in what way should the armed forces develop ment be carried out so as to secure that they will correspond to the nature of the socialist state, will be able to fulfil their purpose and the tasks facing them at every stage of the development of socialist society

The principles of Soviet Armed Forces development are the basic ideas or propositions by which the Communist Party and the Soviet Government are guided in their military policy, in the development of the Armed Forces, and also those guiding all military departments, commanders and chiefs, and the Party organisations in the Army and the Navy They are determined notably by the social and state system, by the aggregate of social relations, and by a number of other factors As regards their content, these principles scientifically reflect the regularities of the class struggle in the world, the building of socialism and com munism, the nature and possibilities of the socialist system at the various stages of its development, and also the devel-

opment of means and methods of warfare They reflect the real links and relations between the social and state system and the Armed Forces, between the Armed Forces and the people, the CPSU and the Soviet Army and Navy, and those within the Armed Forces themselves In other words, the principles are a scientific reflection of the socio political and economic foundations, a concrete application of the Marxist Leninist teaching in the military field

The armed forces development is a complex and many faceted process In keeping with the basic aspects of this process it is expedient to divide the principles underlying the development of the Soviet Armed Forces into the following three groups 1 socio political principles, 2 organisational principles, and 3 principles of training and education Naturally, the division into these three groups is but relative and conditional

The development of the Soviet Armed Forces is indissolubly linked with the principles of general state and Party development and is, in effect, a concrete application of these principles to the specific tasks of the military organisation Lenin said that the experience gained in the development of the Armed Forces should not be considered in isolation from the other fields of Soviet organisation "The development of our army," he emphasised, "led to successful results only because it was carried on in the spirit of general Soviet organisation "[1]

Socio Political Principles

On the one hand, the socio political principles of the Soviet Armed Forces development reflect socialist social relations and the state system, and on the other, express the conscious, purposive activity of the Communist Party and the Soviet state in the military field, are a practical application of Marxist Leninist ideas

The Programme of the CPSU, Party Congress decisions and other Party documents emphasise the decisive role of the leading, organising and educational activity of the Communist Party in the development of the Armed Forces "The Party works unremittingly to increase its organising and guiding influence on the entire life and activity of the Army, Air Force and Navy, to rally the servicemen round

[1] V I Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol 30, p 309

the Communist Party and the Soviet Government, to strengthen the unity of the Armed Forces and the people, and to educate the soldiers in the spirit of courage, bravery, heroism and comradeship with the armies of the socialist countries, of readiness at any moment to take up the defence of their Soviet country, which is building communism,"[1] says the Programme of the CPSU

The increase in the leading role of the Communist Party in the life of the Armed Forces, the strengthening of the influence in them of Party organisations are the main socio-political principle, the most important regularity in the development of the Soviet Armed Forces.

The leading and guiding activity of the CPSU in the development of the Armed Forces assumes many forms It embraces a wide range of questions from military policy to the training and education of the personnel and is carried out in accordance with the Leninist Party principles pertaining to the leadership of the Armed Forces

The CPSU determines the policy of the military department, guides it directly and sees to it that the outlined political course is followed As early as in 1918 the Central Committee adopted at Lenin's proposal the decision "On the Policy of the Military Department" which stated that "the policy of the Military Department, as indeed that of all other departments and institutions, shall be pursued on the basis of the general instructions given by the Party as represented by its Central Committee, and under its direct control" [2]

Subsequent CPSU decisions stressed that this is one of the most important *principles of the Leninist Party in the leadership* of the Army and Navy which must be strictly observed in military development

The new universal military service law is a further development of these principles

Systematic, efficient Party political work is one of the Leninist principles for the guidance of the Armed Forces and is an important means by which the Communist Party

---

[1] *The Road to Communism*, p 558

[2] *KPSS o Vooruzhonnykh Silakh Sovietskogo Soyuza Sbornik dokumentov (1917 1958) (CPSU on the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union. A Collection of Documents [1917 1958])*, Gospolitizdat, Moscow, 1958, p 47

influences the life and activity of the Army and Navy
Lenin noted that a sound foundation for the Soviet Army had been built thanks to the selfless organisational and Party propaganda work carried on by Communists and Party organisations, by the finest people of the working class

Party political work strengthens the military might of the Soviet Army and Navy, military discipline among the personnel, and educates the soldiers in the spirit of devotion to the country, the Communist Party and the Soviet Gov ernment, in the spirit of Soviet patriotism, of friendship between peoples and proletarian internationalism, in the spirit of revolutionary vigilance and hatred for the enemies of communism Party political work helps the soldiers correctly to understand the policy of the Communist Party, develops among the servicemen a feeling of personal re sponsibility for the defence of the country, for the combat readiness of all units

The Communist Party takes effective measures to further improve Party political and ideological work, to strengthen its links with the practice of communist construction, with the tasks of raising the military might and combat readi ness of the Armed Forces

The Party political work in the Army and Navy is carried on by political bodies, commanders at all levels, political workers, Party and Komsomol organisations

The political bodies are a component part of the organi sational structure of the Soviet Armed Forces, they hold an important place in their life and military activities A specific feature of the political bodies is that they combine Party and administrative functions In the field of Party political work they are the leading bodies of the CPSU in the Armed Forces

The entire ideological and political work of the political bodies is aimed at improving the combat training and combat readiness of the troops, at fostering in the soldiers devotion to the country, to the cause of communism and hatred for the enemy, faithfulness to their oath of alle giance, the striving strictly to observe laws and field regu lations

The political bodies expertly go into all aspects of the combat training and political education of the personnel,

organise Marxist Leninist studies for the officers, help the commanding personnel rectify shortcomings in their work, strengthen the one man command principle and military discipline They control the Party organisations on the basis of Leninist principles and standards of Party life, develop the initiative and creative activity of every Party organisation in the fulfilment of the decisions of the CPSU and the tasks set to the Armed Forces by the Party and the Government

Party organisations play an enormous role in implementing the policy of the Party in the Armed Forces, in carrying on Party political work among the soldiers They are called upon to look into all aspects of the combat training and political education of soldiers, closely to coordinate Party political and educational work with the concrete tasks of the personnel, to direct all the powers and energy of the latter at the excellent mastery of modern weapons and equipment, at the strengthening of military discipline The Party organisations in the Army and Navy constantly raise the vanguard role of Communists in combat training and political studies, in military discipline, see to it that Communists should zealously pursue the Party policy and be ahead in everything

The Komsomol organisations are the Party's true helpers in the work with young soldiers They work under the guidance of the political bodies and Party organisations The Komsomol organisations are called upon to support all patriotic undertakings in the troops, to imbue the Komsomol members and all the young people with Marxist Leninist ideas, selfless devotion to the Communist Party and the Soviet Government, faithfulness and selflessness in their service to the country They organise cultural and sports activities among the soldiers, and thereby raise their physical fitness and cultural level

The CPSU is strong and invincible because it not only teaches the masses, but also learns from them, carefully studies the signs foreboding future developments and actively supports every initiative of the working people that promotes the cause of communism Lenin said that success can be achieved only by him who immerses himself deeply into the stream of the people's creative endeavour, who is able to associate himself closely with the

masses and to direct their creative activity at shaping new forms of social life

The CPSU takes care that commanders and political workers, Party organisations and all Communists should always be in close touch with the mass of the servicemen, study their feelings and requirements and react to them without delay The Party organisations and Communists holding command posts should always support the creative initiative of the soldiers, introduce and popularise the experience of advanced officers, NCOs and men

In addition to collective forms of work much importance is attached to the educational work Communists conduct with individual servicemen, to the thorough study of the abilities of servicemen and the causes of their difficulties and successes, to giving them comradely assistance in their studies and the fulfilment of their various duties

Such close contacts with the soldiers promote the development of criticism and self criticism, help opportunely to reveal shortcomings in the training and education of the soldiers, and in Party political work, and to take measures to remove these shortcomings

An important place in the life of the Soviet Armed Forces is held by various links of the Army and Navy Party organisations and the political bodies with local Party organisations Communist servicemen participate in the work of Party conferences and congresses, have the right to elect and be elected to the relevant territorial Party bodies

Political bodies and local Party committees inform each other of the Party political work they are carrying on, organise lectures by representatives of local Party and government bodies in which the soldiers are informed of the working people's achievements in communist construction, while servicemen address the working people

The leadership of the Armed Forces by the Party is based on the *creative application of the Marxist Leninist teaching This is the unshakeable ideological and theoretical basis of the development of the Soviet Armed Forces* Speaking of the enormous difficulties the Communist Party had to cope with in forming for the first time ever an army of a new type, Lenin said that this entirely novel task had

been successfully fulfilled because the Party had consistent ly been guided in it by the Marxist teaching

At all stages of military development the Marxist Lenin ist theory guided the practical activity of the Communist Party, the Soviet state and the entire people, directed at strengthening the defensive capacity of the country

Marxism Leninism is the theoretical foundation of Soviet military science and military doctrine, determining the development of the Armed Forces and the way in which they are used in modern war

The most important socio political principle governing the development of the Soviet Armed Forces is the further consolidation of the unity between the Army and the people As distinct from the exploiter classes, who do everything to isolate the army from the people, the Communist Party considers that the stronger the links between the army and the people, the more successfully will the army fulfil its historical mission of being the defender of the people's in terests and freedom, of their socialist gains

The close links between the Soviet state and the masses, its close links with the workers and peasants are the polit ical basis upon which rests the unity between the Armed Forces and the people

The love and care of the people for their Armed Forces is manifested in many ways they supply the Army and Navy with first class weapons and military equipment, food, and uniforms Of enormous importance to the soldiers of the Soviet Army is the people's moral support, which inspires them to heroic exploits in battles against enemies

A striking manifestation of the unity between the Soviet Army and Navy and the people is direct participation by the working people in the development of the Soviet Armed Forces, such as universal military training, home guard detachments (during the foreign intervention and the Civil War), people's volunteer corps, anti paratroop battalions. local anti aircraft units (during the Great Patriotic War and the fruitful activity of the Voluntary Society for Assis tance to the Army, Air Force and Navy

The Party educates Communists, all Soviet people in the spirit of constant readiness to defend the socialist country, of love for their army It promotes in every way the ac tivities of voluntary defence organisations

Another aspect of the practical embodiment of the unity between the army and the people in the development of the Soviet Armed Forces is the soldiers' boundless love for their people, their selfless defence of the people's interests

A vivid manifestation of this was the mass heroism, courage and bravery of the Soviet troops in the defence of their country The unity between the army and the people is also displayed by the various links of units, for mations, military institutions and military educational es tablishments with collectives of industrial plants and build ing sites, collective and state farmers, schoolchildren and students, and members of voluntary organisations Com manders, political workers and army propagandists partic ipate actively in propaganda, cultural and educational work among the working people in town and country, and in carrying out various socio political campaigns The Soviet soldiers also help the working people in economic development

The participation of servicemen in the work of the Soviets and local Party and Komsomol organisations is also an important form of links between the Armed Forces and the people The extension and strengthening of the links of Party organisations, political bodies and military councils in the Army and Navy with local Party, government, Komsomol and trade union organ isations render invaluable help to the Armed Forces in the patriotic education of the soldiers, help them to realise and feel their unity with the people even more deeply

The *class principle* once played a major role in the devel opment of the Soviet Armed Forces It expressed the class nature of the state and of the Armed Forces, the fact that they were a weapon of the proletarian dictatorship This principle was manifested and implemented in various forms in the selection and distribution of the command personnel, in the recruitment of the Army and Navy, in which much attention was given to increasing the percent age of workers in the Armed Forces, while non working, exploiter elements were banned from the ranks This prin ciple was also expressed in the content of the ideological and political education of the soldiers.

Some of the forms expressing the class principle in the development of the Armed Forces changed when the remnants of the exploiter classes in the country had been abolished and the moral and political unity of society achieved

This change is expressed in particular in the way in which the Army and Navy personnel is recruited, in the selection and appointment of the officers Before the triumph of socialism in the USSR there were limitations for non working people, for people descending from the former exploiter classes (kulaks, merchants and others), as of 1936, however, these limitations were removed because they were no longer pertinent following the liquidation of these groups The right and duty to defend the socialist country applied in equal measure to all Soviet citizens

Social origin is also disregarded in the selection and promotion of officers At present the Armed Forces are officered by the best representatives of all layers of Soviet society The main criterion in promotion in the Army and Navy are devotion to the people and the socialist country. high moral political and business qualities. individual abilities

Another principle governing the development of the Soviet Armed Forces is *the principle of strengthening socialist internationalism and the friendship of the peoples of the USSR.* It is expressed in the fact that all socialist nations and nationalities in the USSR have a single military organisation the multinational Armed Forces; that the equal right and duty of all citizens of the USSR, irrespective of their nationality and race, to fulfil their military duty, is strictly observed, that the education of Soviet soldiers is carried on in the spirit of friendship and fraternity between the peoples of the USSR, in the spirit of friendship with the peoples of the socialist countries and the military co operation with their armies, in the spirit of deep respect for all working people, of the awareness of their internationalist duty to the working people of all countries

In the first years of the Soviet power Lenin advanced the idea of the military unity of the Soviet Republics, which has been successfully realised Such measures as the establishment of a single command over all formations of the Red Army, the strict centralisation in the distribution of all

forces and resources of the socialist republics, the unification of supply, transport and other vital branches, were among the decisive conditions securing the Soviet Republic's victory in the Civil War

The military unity became even stronger and acquired a qualitatively new content and form when the peoples of the fraternal Soviet socialist republics united in a single state the USSR, and created single Armed Forces

The idea of uniting the military efforts of the socialist states for the joint rebuff of imperialist aggressors is of enormous importance in present day conditions It has been embodied in the defensive alliance of the Warsaw Treaty member countries and the Joint Command of the Armed Forces, and also in the bilateral treaties between the socialist countries on friendship, co operation and mutual assistance "If the need arises, the closely knit family of signatories to the Pact will rise solidly in defence of the socialist system, in defence of the free life of our peoples, and will deliver a crushing blow to any aggressor "[1]

It was stated at the 24th CPSU Congress that "the Party highly values the patriotic spirit of Soviet people and their readiness to devote themselves wholly to promoting their socialist motherland's prosperity and defending the gains of the Revolution and the cause of socialism" [2]

Organisational Principles

The concrete historical conditions in which the proletarian revolution is carried out and in which socialist construction is launched, determine the character of the military organisation of the socialist states

The Soviet Government encountered enormous difficulties in creating the Army and Navy because there was no experience in the development of the armed forces of a socialist state "The organisation of a Red Army," Lenin said, "was an entirely new question which had never been dealt with before, even theoretically "[3]

Karl Marx and Frederick Engels advanced the idea of creating a proletarian military organisation of a new type

---

[1] *23rd Congress of the CPSU*, p 14

[2] *24th Congress of the CPSU*, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House Moscow, 1971, p 101

[3] V I Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol 29, p 152

On the basis of an analysis and generalisation of the experience of the 1848-1849 revolution, and especially of the Paris Commune, they drew the conclusion that the first commandment of any victorious revolution is to smash the old army, to disband it, and to create a new one in its place

In defining the character of the victorious proletariat's military organisation, Marx and Engels proceeded, first, from the premise that the socialist revolution would triumph simultaneously in all or in most of developed capitalist countries, second, from the state of the armed forces and military skills in the second half of the 19th century, third, from an analysis of the internal nature of socialist society

They therefore believed that wars between socialist countries and bourgeois or pre-bourgeois states would be possible only during the first period of the revolution and that the socialist state would need a massive armed force during that period only. Marx and Engels took into account also the fact that in the past century a strong military bureaucratic machine had been created only in the large European continental states (France, Germany, Russia), while Britain and the USA did not as yet possess such forces. In view of the above Marx and Engels formulated the proposition that in the process of the socialist revolution the bourgeois army must be replaced by the general arming of the people, by a socialist militia

The Russian Marxists, headed by Lenin, developed this Marxist proposition and rendered it concrete

Lenin and the Bolshevik Party worked out a military programme for the proletarian revolution in the new historical conditions. They advanced the task of smashing the old army and creating a military organisation of the socialist state, and laid a theoretical foundation for the need to carry out these tasks

Before the October Revolution and immediately after its triumph, the Communist Party and the Soviet Government did not intend to create a regular army, but were guided by the Marxist proposition of replacing the regular army by a socialist militia. The armed intervention of international imperialism and the vast scope assumed by the Civil War made it necessary to revise this proposition. It was Lenin's great merit that he was the first Marxist coura-

geously to advance and to lay a theoretical foundation for the idea that the Soviet state needed a regular army

The basic principles for the organisation of the Soviet army were laid down in Lenin's works and in Party decisions The main principles underlying this organisation are. the setting up of regular Armed Forces, the improvement of their structure, the co ordinated development of the services and arms of the services, their constant combat readiness, the selection and appointment of officers in accordance with their business and political qualities, and their education in the spirit of boundless devotion to the socialist country and to the cause of communism, centralism in the organisational structure and in the control of the troops, one man command and strict military discipline

The Soviet Armed Forces were created while desperate battles were waged against numerous enemies coming on from all sides The lack of any experience in this field posed additional difficulties to the Party and was responsible for some mistakes there were people who did not understand that the Workers' and Peasants' Red Army would be unable to fulfil its historical mission without strict military discipline and a centralised command

The enemies of the Soviet Union took advantage of all these difficulties They frenziedly resisted all measures taken by the Communist Party and the Soviet Government in the development of the Army and Navy. The Socialist Revolutionaries, Mensheviks and various anarchist elements, all opposed the setting up of a regular, disciplined army with a single centralised command The Communist Party headed by Lenin fought these opponents resolutely

At the Eighth Party Congress Lenin and his followers decisively rebuffed the "army opposition", which was against strict discipline and centralised command of the army, insisted on a continuation of the partisan tactics inherited from the past, and thus obstructed the setting up of a regular army The views of the "army opposition" were rejected and branded wrong and harmful The Congress adopted Lenin's proposal to set up a regular Red Army At the same time the Congress pointed out that it would be possible to make the transition to a socialist militia, when this would be warranted by the international situation

A regular army is superior to the militia system. The troops of a regular army are much better trained, disciplined and organised.

The formations and units of the regular army are raised and stationed irrespective of the place of domicile and work of the draftees. Citizens called to the colours are freed from all other kinds of work for a long time, and military service becomes their main occupation. This makes it possible to organise their systematic training. The nucleus of the regular army is the cadre commanding echelon which is made up of professional soldiers.

The regular army of the socialist state is formed on the basis of the universal military service. The Constitution of the USSR says that military service in the Armed Forces of the USSR is the honourable duty of citizens of the USSR. In accordance with the above the new Law on Universal Military Service stipulates that all male citizens of the USSR, irrespective of their race, nationality, faith, education, social and property status shall serve in the Soviet Armed Forces. The law provides for military service also of women having medical or other specialised training. The law provides for the training for the Army and Navy of specialists from among young people prior to their being called up for active service.

The regular army is superior to a militia type of organisation when a military attack threatens the country and in times of war. The regular army is able to take action and rebuff a sudden attack of the enemy without preliminary mobilisation. This is particularly important in contemporary conditions, when the threat of sudden nuclear strikes by the aggressors hangs over the socialist countries.

Regular armed forces therefore form the basis of the military organisation in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. As long as the imperialist powers have powerful regular armies and reject the idea of general and complete disarmament, the socialist countries are compelled to preserve and improve their regular armed forces.

The principle of the organisation of a regular army and navy is indissolubly linked with *the principle of the continual improvement of their organisational structure, the proportionate and co-ordinated development of the services*

and arms of the services, the maintenance of constant combat readiness in accordance with the development of military affairs and the tasks of the armed defence of the socialist country

The CPSU does not believe in looking for an absolutely correct form of Party organisation, one that would be suitable at all the stages of the revolutionary process, and also of methods for the work of such an organisation The forms of the organisation and the methods of its work depend wholly on the specific historical situation and the tasks arising from it

As applied to the development of the Armed Forces this principle means that the question of the structure of the Armed Forces, of changes in organisational forms and the correlation of the services and arms is decided by the Communist Party on the basis of a comprehensive analysis of the country's internal affairs and international situation, of the development of the means and methods of armed struggle, in accordance with the tasks of defending the socialist country

The Communist Party has always shown great concern for the development of the new services and arms, vigilantly followed the rapid development of new weapons and equipment in the capitalist world Prior to the industrialisation of the country, however, the Soviet state had only very limited possibilities in this field Socialist industrialisation has created a powerful defence industry which has made it possible to technically re equip the Soviet Army, to create new services so as to keep pace with the contemporary level of military affairs

A powerful Air Force and Navy, artillery units, armoured and mechanised troops, and special technical troops were set up and infantry units and formations were supplied with new arms and equipment The organisational structure of the Armed Forces improved accordingly [1]

The continuous improvement of the organisational structure, the development and correct correlation of all services and arms were important to ensuring the supremacy and victory of the Soviet Armed Forces over the nazi Army and Navy in the Great Patriotic War

[1] For details see Chapters 6 and 7

In connection with the revolution in military affairs and the important changes in the international situation in the post war years, the CPSU and the Soviet Government have continued to give their unrelenting attention to improving the organisational structure of the Army and Navy

The consistent use of the Leninist organisational principles, tested and corroborated by the long standing experience of the development of the Soviet Armed Forces, is an important condition for the correspondence of the organisational structure of the armed forces to the modern level of military affairs and the complex tasks of ensuring the security of the Soviet Union and of the entire socialist community

Of the greatest importance to the development of the Soviet Armed Forces is *the principle of centralism* It is an adaptation to the specific conditions in the Soviet Armed Forces of the principle of democratic centralism. which underlies Party and government development

The need for strict centralisation in the Armed Forces is dictated by the nature of their tasks The leadership and control of the troops must secure the maximum of organisation and discipline, the flexibility and rapidity of action necessary to fulfil combat tasks in actions against a strong and skilled enemy, and to establish co operation in combat An efficient centralised leadership and control of the troops is particularly important in modern conditions, when the Army and Navy are equipped with nuclear weapons, when there is the danger of a sudden attack by imperialist aggressors, who may use all and every means of mass destruction

The principle of centralism in the organisational structure of the Armed Forces and in the system of their control consists in the subordination of all formations of the Army and Navy and of their command bodies to the central bodies of the state power, to a single supreme command The lower command bodies shall strictly fulfil the orders, directives and instructions of superior bodies and account to them for their activity, for the morale, political state, combat efficiency and combat readiness of the troops Centralism in the development of the Armed Forces is ensured by their nation wide structuring, the appointment

of the higher commanding personnel by the government bodies and the relevant command, by the rigid control over compliance with orders effected by senior links over subordinates.

The system of centralised command is characterised by the demarcation of the functions of the central command apparatus and the links subordinated to it, since this promotes broad initiative and the necessary independence of action in the fulfilment of their tasks. Particular importance is attached to the maintenance of constant links between the command and the troops.

The principle of one man command is a most important principle in the Armed Forces development

Lenin laid the theoretical foundation for the need to apply one man command, especially in the army. He emphasised that under socialism there is no fundamental contradiction between socialist democratism and the vesting of extensive authority in individuals because such authority is vested in the latter by the genuinely popular Soviet power, which selects them from among the most worthy representatives of the people, who are able successfully to implement the policy of the Party and the Government, correctly to express the will of the working people. Every commander acts under the constant supervision of the Party and the Soviet government and is accountable to them.

One man command emerged and developed in the Armed Forces as an expression of the objective need for ensuring the unity of will and action of large masses of people, iron discipline and organisation to achieve definite aims, for example, the concentration of all forces to rout the enemy. This unity and purposefulness of action can be attained, Lenin said, by subordinating the will of thousands to the will of one, by the strict subordination of the mass to the single will of the commanders. The experience of the Red Army clearly supports the need for one man command which has proved to be the best method of command. "This experience," Lenin said, "is worth thinking about. Developing systematically, it passed from a corporate form that was casual and vague to a corporate form elevated to the status of a system of organisation and permeating all the institutions of the army, and now, as a general tendency, it has

arrived at the principle of one man responsibility as the only correct method of work "[1]

Considering one man command the most suitable form of command, the Communist Party resolved this question by taking into account the social make up of the commanding personnel, their training and political maturity, and also the willingness of the masses to accept a definite form of command

In the first years of the development of the Red Army, when a large number of ex officers of the old tsarist army were among the commanders, and also in the headquarters, while the Red commanders did not possess sufficient military theoretical knowledge and experience in political work, a form of command had to be found that would serve the interests of the proletarian dictatorship and would at the same time suit the specific features of the military organisation Dual command, under which a unit was headed by two persons the commander and the commissar was such a form

During the Civil War and the foreign armed intervention the commissars played an exclusively important role in the formation and consolidation of the Red Army They introduced organisation and iron proletarian discipline into the ranks, inspired them to heroism in action, consolidated them round the Bolshevik Party In addition to carrying on Party political work, the commissars supervised all the specific army activities drill, administrative and logistic work, combat training, etc

When alien and unworthy commanders had been weeded out and the political and military theoretical level of commanders hailing from the working people had risen, it became unnecessary for two persons to deal simultaneously and in parallel with command, administrative and logistic questions The increase in the share of Party members among the commanders, and the intense political education of the commanders created conditions for the merging of the two lines of command the military and the political Therefore, in keeping with the decisions of the Party CC, preparations were made for the introduction of one man

[1] V I Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol 30, p 310

command throughout the army as early as 1924, and it was implemented in 1928.

Later, the institution of commissars, vested with wide powers, was reintroduced for a short period in the early stages of the Great Patriotic War. After the military commissars had carried out their functions one man command was reinstated in the Armed Forces in October 1942. Many commissars and political workers were transferred to commanding posts and others were appointed assistant commanders for political matters in units and formations.

One man command in the army means that the commander is personally responsible to the Party and government for all aspects of the life and activity of the unit under his command (warships, units and institutions of the Soviet Army and Navy), that he is in charge of training, political, administrative and economic matters.

The concentration of all command functions in his hands enables the commander to make the work of all his subordinates extremely purposeful. One man command creates particularly favourable conditions for smooth and flexible control during combat action, for the effective use of the material and technical means and human resources in the fulfilment of combat tasks, and ensures the unity of the personnel's will and action.

One man command in the armies of socialist countries differs fundamentally from one man command in the armies of exploiter states. This distinction is conditioned by the different socio-political content of the functions carried out by the commanders in armies of countries with opposing social systems. This opposition is at the root of differences in, first, the possibilities of the commanders in these armies, second, in the methods used to maintain military discipline, and, third, in the type of one man command.

In the armies of the socialist countries the commanders rely on the assistance of the Party and Komsomol organisations, use all forms of mass work possible in the Armed Forces to ensure the active participation of the men in the implementation of the tasks connected with combat training and political education, in the strengthening of military discipline and the adherence to the field regulations. Among them are soldiers' meetings and conferences attended by various categories of servicemen, the press, socialist

emulation drives, etc All commanders and chiefs are ob liged to develop and encourage criticism and self criticism, which is an important means of revealing and removing shortcomings in the life and activity of the units

The orders of officers are not subject to criticism, which is explained by the specifics of the military organisation and the tasks fulfilled by the army

While the order itself is not subject to discussion and must be carried out without remonstrance, the question of how to ensure its execution in time and in the best possible way can and must be discussed at Party and Komsomol meetings, at conferences and meetings of servicemen, when conditions permit the holding of such meetings and confer ences Such discussions help the soldiers to understand their tasks, mobilise the soldiers for their fulfilment

One man command in the Armed Forces, even though it is the main form of command, does not exclude colle giate forms, but is rationally combined with them

Military councils are bodies of collective leadership They incorporate not only the military leaders, but also leading Party functionaries The military councils discuss key questions concerning the life and activity of the troops This gives commanders greater confidence in controlling their troops, in implementing the policy of the Party and the government

Party political work, the active participation of the com manders in its organisation and implementation, are a necessary condition for carrying out and strengthening one man command

Thanks to the constant care of the Communist Party and Soviet Government, the commanders are well trained in military technical and operational tactical respects, educat ed in the spirit of Marxism Leninism, socialist patriotism and internationalism, and enjoy well deserved authority with their subordinates

The commanders (chiefs) in the Army and Navy enjoy authority because they are competent in their profession. are experienced leaders and organisers, and because the Party and government have placed trust in them Incontest able authority is enjoyed by commanders who constantly take pains to raise their military and political standards, give an example to their subordinates of unreproachable

conduct, of strict observance of laws, regulations, orders and instructions. To build up their authority commanders should maintain constant contacts with the officers and men, personally guide the combat training and political education themselves, take care to ensure the satisfaction of the material and spiritual requirements of the servicemen, to be demanding on themselves and on their subordinates, just and polite.

The maintenance of strict military discipline based on the high consciousness of the soldiers is one of the most important principles in the development of the Soviet Armed Forces. This principle is specific in that it arises from the social nature of the Soviet Army and Navy as a military organisation of a new type, and at the same time underlies both the organisation of the Armed Forces development and the training and education of the troops.

Military discipline is an inalienable part of any army. Discipline in the Soviet Army differs radically from the discipline in the armies of exploiter states. Relations of co-operation and fraternal mutual assistance between the working people, and the social and political unity of the people, are the social basis of Soviet military discipline; communist consciousness, the understanding and conscious fulfilment by the servicemen of their military duty are its ideological basis.

Counterposing Soviet military discipline to the brutal and unthinking discipline in bourgeois armies, Lenin said: "An army needs the strictest discipline.... The Red Army established unprecedentedly firm discipline—not by means of the lash, but based on the intelligence, loyalty and devotion of the workers and peasants themselves."[1]

In the USSR military discipline "is based not on fear of punishment or on coercion, but on the high political consciousness and communist education of the servicemen, on their deep understanding of their patriotic duty, the internationalist tasks of their people, on their selfless devotion to the socialist country, the Communist Party and the Soviet Government. But persuasion does not exclude the adoption of coercive measures to servicemen who are negligent in the

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 250.

fulfilment of their military duties."[1] Lenin said that coercion, when it is necessary, can be used successfully only if it is based on persuasion. "Persuasion," Lenin said, "must come before coercion."[2]

In the Soviet Army and Navy military discipline cannot be maintained mechanically, as it is in the armies of the imperialist states, where it is imposed by means of violence and the duping of the soldiers, and also by bribing part of the servicemen. When the socialist revolution begins, a different discipline is born, one based on trust and the organisation of the working people, on comradeship, respect, independence and initiative.

Emphasising the decisive importance of persuasion in maintaining strict military discipline, M. V. Frunze, a Soviet military leader, said that "the best commander will be the one who fulfils his task without resorting to repressive measures".[3] This does not mean, of course, that there should be indulgence of servicemen who commit serious breaches of military discipline. In those cases coercive and disciplinary measures should be used without hesitation, but they should be used wisely so as to be educative.

The main task is to inculcate in the soldiers a deep understanding of the importance and necessity for perfect organisation and strict military discipline.

To ensure the constant combat readiness of the troops, Lenin said, it is necessary to secure "military discipline and military vigilance of the highest degree...".[4]

Lenin's instruction has acquired particular importance in present-day conditions when the danger of the use by the imperialists of mass-destruction weapons has grown immeasurably. At present the enemy cannot be vanquished in battle without the most efficient organisation and strictest discipline, which requires an accurate and unconditional fulfilment of the orders and instructions given by commanders.

Strict military discipline is possible only if the regula-

---

[1] *Distsiplinarny ustav Vooruzhonnykh Sil Soyuza SSR (Field Regulations of the Armed Forces of the USSR)*, Voyenizdat, 1962, pp. 5-6.

[2] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 212.

[3] M. V. Frunze, *Izbranniye proizvedeniya (Selected Works)*, Vol. II, p. 73.

[4] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 447.

tions are firmly observed, if strictness by the commander is combined with daily educational work, if Party and Komsomol members show an example of accurate execution of duties and of perfect conduct.

Public pressure on servicemen neglecting their duties plays a major role in strengthening military discipline. Such pressure may take the form of discussions of their conduct at servicemen's meetings, in the Komsomol organisation, criticism in the press, etc. Of greatest importance is the personal example and authority of commanders and chiefs, and their strictness. Genuine strictness is incompatible with rudeness to one's subordinates. The CPSU supports strict and just commanders and chiefs, but condemns all distortions of the principles of Soviet military discipline, all errors in its enforcement.

The Principles of Education and Training

The Soviet Armed Forces have a streamlined system for the military training and political education of the personnel, the unshakeable ideological basis of which is Marxism-Leninism. The main task of that system is to develop soldiers' faculties in all respects for the defence of the socialist country, to educate in them high moral and combat qualities, to arm them with profound political and military-technical knowledge, to help them work out practical skills and the ability to wage armed struggle.

The means and methods of educational work, the organisation of combat training and political education must correspond to the aims and tasks of education and training. The unity of the aims, means and methods is achieved by the consistent application of principles of education and training which reflect the objective regularities of the education of members of socialist society, the education and training of Soviet soldiers.

The general principles of training and education are: communist purposefulness and devotion to the Party; the close connection of training and education with the practical tasks of communist construction, with the task of strengthening the might and combat readiness of the Armed Forces; the education and training of soldiers whilst they are going through service and their active participation in that process; the combination of mass forms of training and educa-

tion with a differentiated approach to the trainees, individual work with them; the combination of strictness to subordinates with respect for their personal dignity and concern for their needs.

Alongside with these general principles applying to training and education in all fields, there are specific principles, applying primarily to the various fields of the training of Soviet soldiers, for example, such principles as the use of visual methods, simplicity, etc.

The specific feature of these principles is their clearly expressed purposefulness, their subordination to the fundamental tasks the Soviet people and their Armed Forces have to implement. This is strikingly demonstrated, for example, by the principle of communist purposefulness and devotion to the Party. The process of the education and training can be effective only if the educators have a clear understanding of the aims of communist education, if the ideological level of the measures taken is high and tends to grow further, if it takes into account the future trends of training and education. This principle incorporates purposefulness in the choice and use of the means and methods used by the commanders, political workers, Party and Komsomol organisations.

The application of the principles of training and education of the personnel presupposes, first and foremost, the fulfilment of the requirements of the CPSU in the ideological field, the ideological and political education of the servicemen.

The proper application of the principles of training and education depends largely on the officer corps, on the educators. Therefore, *the education of leaders, of the educators themselves, is a highly important task.* All officers in the Army and Navy, irrespective of the posts they hold, are the leaders and educators of their subordinates. They must therefore possess high Party qualities, master the Marxist-Leninist theory and concrete sciences to perfection and apply them in practice. "The Party," the Programme of the CPSU says, "will work indefatigably to train Army and Navy officers and political personnel fully devoted to the communist cause and recruited among the finest representatives of the Soviet people. It considers it necessary for the officer corps tirelessly to master Marxist-Leninist theory, to

possess a high standard of military-technical training, meet all the requirements of modern military theory and practice, strengthen military discipline."[1]

The greater demands made upon the commanders in connection with the equipment of the troops with complicated weapons and the more complex tasks facing them in the training and education of their men make it necessary for every commander to possess the qualities of a leader, to be proficiently trained in all military fields, to be an organiser and educator. These qualities are worked out and developed by daily studies and self-education. Only those officers, who systematically study and are familiar with the great achievements in the social and natural sciences, technology and military science, can become good educators and leaders. Military leaders must know how to work with people, must know the fundamentals of pedagogics and psychology, constantly show concern for the living conditions, studies and the organisation of the leisure of their subordinates.

Special attention is given to the education of young officers, the education and training of sergeants, the most numerous commanding personnel and the assistants of the officers in the education and training of men.

An important means of educating and training soldiers, of ensuring a high combat efficiency and constant combat readiness of the Armed Forces is a well-planned and efficiently organised combat training and political education of the ranks. In the Soviet Armed Forces they are fully subordinated to the requirement of *teaching the soldiers what is needed in war, training the troops to vanquish a strong and technically well-equipped opponent.* Training must therefore be carried out in conditions resembling combat as closely as possible and in a spirit of active offensive operations against an aggressor with a view to routing him utterly.

The principle of the unity of training and education is consistently implemented in the combat training and political education of Soviet soldiers. This is a necessary condition for raising the quality of combat training, the educa-

[1] *Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, Moscow, 1961, p. 93.

tion in the soldiers of love for the army, a conscious attitude to the subjects of study, a striving to use the knowledge they acquire in the most efficient way.

A specific feature of all training and education in the Soviet Armed Forces is that it is deeply scientific. The CPSU proceeds from the view that defects in the training and education of the servicemen cannot be remedied in the course of a war. Therefore, training and education must be arranged so that decisive results are obtained in peacetime. This must be promoted by the corresponding moral and psychological preparation of the soldiers.

The results of the training and education of the soldiers find concentrated expression in the *constant combat readiness of the Armed Forces*, which is determined by the readiness of all services and all arms, and also of the logistics agencies. At the same time constant combat readiness depends on every serviceman, on his energy, knowledge, skill and initiative, on the various sub-units, crews, units, warships, etc.

3. THE ARMED FORCES OF THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES

The development of armies of a new type in the socialist countries shows that while there are some specific features in their development, it is the common regularities that are chief and decisive. This is because the states in the socialist system are of the same economic and political type, and because they all adhere to the identical Marxist-Leninist ideology, which is expressed in the unity of the aims and tasks of their armies, in the unity of the principles underlying their leadership by the Communist and Workers' Parties, their development, and the education and training of the personnel. At the same time the specific features in the development of each army must be taken into account in order to ensure the further consolidation of these armies, correctly to organise their co-operation and to increase their combat efficiency.

Historical experience also shows that any deviation from Marxist-Leninist principles in development, education and training, any deviation from the principle of co-operation of

the socialist armies, lowers the defensive capacity of the states of the socialist system, endangers the revolutionary gains of the people and the possibility of successful socialist construction.

The Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries, having created armies of a new type, have proved that the experience of Soviet military development is not of local but of international significance. They use it successfully, while taking into account the historical and national specifics of their countries.

Specific Features in the Formation and Development of an Army of a New Type

The armies of a number of socialist countries have inherited the noble traditions of the armed detachments of the working class, created under the leadership of the Communist Parties during the revolutionary battles waged between 1918 and 1923. During those years armed detachments were created in Bulgaria, Hungary, Germany, Poland and some other countries to fight for the socialist revolution. Some of them were called the Red Guard or the Red Army. Many of the men and commanders in these detachments had formerly fought in the international units of the Red Army of Soviet Russia. There were also Russian workers and peasants in the ranks of the Hungarian Red Army, the Red Guard and Red Army in Germany, in the armed detachments of the Polish proletariat. Thus, the comradeship-in-arms of the proletariat of different countries in the fight for national and social liberation, against common enemies, is a regularity that is fully manifested in the relations between the armed forces of the socialist states to this day.

In 1921 the Mongolian working people, relying on the fraternal assistance of the Soviet Red Army, won the armed struggle against foreign oppressors and local feudals. The relations between the Soviet Army and the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Army (the People's Army of the Mongolian People's Republic since 1955) clearly showed features typical of the relations between the new armies: they helped each other to fight the common enemy, the Soviet Union helped to equip the Mongolian Army with the latest weapons, the Mongolian Army mastered advanced Soviet military science, and the two armies supported each other in combat actions. In 1939 the Soviet and Mongolian soldiers

jointly inflicted a crushing defeat to the Japanese aggressors. In the summer of 1945 the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Army, in joint action with units of the Soviet Army and the People's Liberation Army of China, contributed to the rout of the Kwantung Army and the liberation of the Chinese people from the Japanese invaders.

The Chinese Red Army (renamed in 1937 into the People's Liberation Army) was set up in 1927 in the course of the revolutionary-liberation struggle of the working class and the peasantry against the bourgeois and landowner counter-revolutionaries. It became the chief force in the Chinese people's struggle against the Japanese invaders. Before the rout of Japanese militarism by the Soviet Armed Forces the People's Liberation Army of China was logistically linked with areas in which there was no industrial proletariat and recruited exclusively peasants. During that period it considered the struggle for the national liberation of the country its main task.

The Soviet Army gave decisive assistance to the Chinese people in routing the Japanese invaders. Of great importance was the transfer to the People's Liberation Army of the weapons and equipment seized by the Soviet troops from the Kwantung Army. As a result, when Chiang Kai-shek's army mounted military operations against the People's Liberation Army in 1946, the latter was well-equipped and well-prepared for the struggle against the internal counter-revolutionaries. Of decisive importance at that stage was also the fact that the Soviet Union prevented the transfer of any considerable contingents of US troops to China. The counter-revolutionary forces did not receive help by direct US military intervention as they had expected. The great strength and decisive stand of the Soviet Union prevented the use of atom bombs against the Chinese people by the USA, on which some US political and military leaders were insisting. In these favourable external conditions the People's Liberation Army of China smashed Chiang Kai-shek's troops and only their remnants escaped to the island of Taiwan which was occupied by the United States of America. The Chinese leaders do not want to speak about it now.

After 1958 the development of the People's Liberation Army of China differed substantially from that of the

socialist armies. During that period it was used to fight Party committees, the trade unions and the bodies of the people's power. The personnel was indoctrinated with the ideology of militant anti-Sovietism, hegemonism and nationalism.

The modern people's armies of Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and also the Albanian army emerged as anti-fascist armed detachments which were set up for the struggle against the German and Italian invaders between 1941 and 1944 on the initiative and under the leadership of the Communist Parties. In the struggle against the Japanese invaders the Communist Parties of Korea and Vietnam organised armed revolutionary detachments which grew into the present People's Armies of the Korean People's Democratic Republic and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

The internal and external conditions of the struggle against fascism determined the principal forms in which the people's armed formations initially emerged and developed. These forms were: guerilla detachments and groups, people's liberation armies and armed formations organised in the Soviet Union.

The first guerilla groups and detachments were created in Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Albania after the nazis attacked the USSR. Their nucleus was formed of Party and Komsomol members. The rout of the German fascist troops near Moscow and at Stalingrad by the Soviet Army opened to the working masses of the countries occupied by nazi Germany the prospect of a full victory over fascism. The guerilla movement in a number of countries assumed a mass scale and tens of thousands of workers, working peasants and intellectuals joined the partisan detachments. The guerilla movement was led by the Communist Parties. Party organisations were set up in the detachments and groups, and there were military commissars in most guerilla formations. The men were educated in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, were educated to fight for the solution of the tasks of the anti-fascist, anti-imperialist revolution and for the subsequent carrying out of the socialist revolution.

A higher form of organisation of the armed detachments of a new type were the people's liberation armies, which

were created on the basis of the guerilla detachments and drew large numbers of the working masses into the armed struggle against the foreign invaders and "domestic" fascism. In Yugoslavia the first detachments of the People's Liberation Army emerged at the end of 1941. In 1943 the Armia Ludowa was formed in Poland, and in 1943 the People's Liberation Insurgent Army in Bulgaria. The leadership of the people's liberation armies, as well as of the guerilla detachments, was effected by the Communist Parties only. The Communists took into account the expanding social basis of the armed anti-fascist movement, with the broad mass of the workers, peasants and intellectuals being drawn into active struggle for the implementation of anti-fascist general democratic reforms. To expand the armed struggle against fascism the Communist Parties in some countries co-operated with the progressive forces in the democratic parties (the peasants', Social-Democratic parties, the parties of the petty urban bourgeoisie and part of the medium bourgeoisie). As the joint struggle of all progressive forces against fascism intensified, popular fronts and governments of the popular front were set up. The leading force in the popular fronts were the Communist Parties, the initiators and leaders of the anti-fascist struggle.

The formation of people's liberation armies was of great military and political importance. As distinct from the guerilla detachments, the army was a component part of the emergent revolutionary state. This exerted a major influence on the layers of the population who were still vacillating, added to their conviction in the victory of the revolutionary forces. It became possible to concentrate all efforts of the revolutionary army at striking at communications, large garrisons and the main groupings of the enemy, to foil punitive operations, to liberate and firmly hold whole districts of the country, to set up supply bases, hospitals, etc., in the liberated districts. The creation of people's liberation armies made it possible to organise operational co-operation between these armies and the Soviet Armed Forces and the people's liberation armies of other countries.

Before the emergence of the state of a new type the guerilla detachments and people's liberation armies were the

most important, and in some countries the only means through which the Communist Parties exerted influence on the broad mass of the working people, an instrument for the mobilisation of the latter for the struggle for national and social liberation. The people's liberation armies carried out political and economic revolutionary transformations on the territories liberated from the enemy, acted as administrative and judicial bodies. Of great importance was the creation by representatives of the people's liberation armies of local democratic organs of power, the distribution among the working peasants of the land and the property of feudals who had fled the country, the lowering of rents, and the supply of the working people with foodstuffs seized from the enemy.

Such functions could be fulfilled only by armies of a new type. The more resolute and deeper were the reforms they carried out in all spheres of social life, the more actively were they supported by the working masses, and the more workers and peasants in those countries joined the national liberation and revolutionary struggle.

A specific form of anti-fascist armed contingents were the 1st and 2nd Polish armies, the 1st Czechoslovak army corps and the two volunteer Rumanian divisions formed in the Soviet Union. Together with the guerilla detachments and the people's liberation armies they formed the basis of the armed forces of a new type in their countries. The birth and consolidation of the first socialist state in the world enabled the working class and the working masses of non-socialist countries, for the first time in history, to set up their armed contingents on its territory, and thus to resolve the tasks of freeing their countries from all forms of national and social oppression and later of defending their revolutionary gains. The Soviet state provided them with up-to-date weapons and military equipment, and the Soviet soldiers shared their rich experience with them and assisted them constantly in joint operations.

The units formed on Soviet territory were open to all patriots wishing to participate in the struggle for the liberation of their countries from the nazi invaders. The vast majority of the men and non-commissioned officers and a large part of the officers were workers, peasants and intellectuals.

The volunteer Rumanian divisions were manned by prisoners of war—active anti-fascists, mainly workers and peasants—who expressed the wish to take up arms to fight for the liberation from the German invaders and the Antonescu regime. Most officers were retrained non-commissioned officers and men, former workers or peasants.

Communists with experience in revolutionary struggle, some with combat experience acquired in the international brigades in Spain, were generally made political workers.

A major role was played also by the fact that the Czech, Slovak, Polish and Rumanian working people had learned from the experience of the USSR of the advantages of the socialist system and decisively opposed the forces who wanted to restore the capitalist system in countries liberated from the nazi invaders.

During the battles for the liberation of their countries the contingents set up in the Soviet Union united with the guerilla detachments in Poland and Czechoslovakia and with the Workers' Guard in Rumania. This strengthened yet further the proletarian core in the anti-fascist people's armies and accelerated their transformation into armies of a new type, as the socialist revolution was unfolding.

Of great interest in this connection is the experience of the Communist Parties of Bulgaria and Rumania in the radical transformation of their armies from instruments of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie into instruments of the dictatorship of the working class.

From the beginning of the armed anti-fascist struggle, from June 1941, the Bulgarian Workers' Party (Communists)—BWP(C)—took steps to draw the army over to the side of the revolution and to prepare it for participation in the armed uprising. By September 1944 underground soldiers' committees of members of the BWP(C) and the RMS[1] had been set up in most companies, battalions and regiments. During the uprising, the soldiers' committees, carrying out the policy of the BWP(C) in matters of military development, dismissed the reactionary officers and introduced in the army a new, conscious discipline, set up

[1] *RMS* (*Rabotnicheski Mladezhki Soyuz*)—a revolutionary youth organisation guided by the Bulgarian Communist Party.

efficient revolutionary units, educated the personnel in the spirit of devotion to the Communist Party and the National Front.

The armed uprising of September 9, 1944 marked the beginning of the socialist revolution in Bulgaria. Therefore, the Bulgarian Communists were faced with the problem of forming a workers' and peasants' army able to defend the socialist gains immediately after the triumph of the revolution. At the initiative and under the leadership of the BWP(C), detachments of the National Liberation Insurgent Army were incorporated in the army units. Most commanders and commissars of the Insurgent Army were appointed to commanding posts in the new army. As of September 20, 1944 the post of assistant commander for political matters was introduced. These assistants were assigned the role of political commissars. A decisive role was also played by the setting up of Party and Komsomol organisations in all units and sub-units.

As regards the class composition of the officer corps and the discipline practised in it, the Rumanian Army remained a bourgeois-landowner one even after the overthrow of Antonescu's fascist regime. It remained part of the state apparatus in which representatives of the bourgeois and landowner parties were in the majority. However, according to the terms of the armistice agreement, the observance of which was strictly supervised by the Soviet Army, the reactionary forces could not use the Rumanian Army against the working people.

In March 1945 the National Democratic Front, headed by the Communist Party, came to power in Rumania. This ushered in the process of the liquidation of the bourgeois-landowner army and the creation of an army of the new type. In the solution of this task the Communist Party relied on the two volunteer divisions formed on Soviet territory and on the armed workers' detachments created during the armed uprising against the fascist regime. A major role in revolutionising the army was played by 16 Rumanian divisions which participated in the operations against nazi Germany between September 1944 and May 1945.

The development of armies of the new type in the People's Democracies in the course of socialist construction had a number of important specific features.

Vestiges of bourgeois discipline were preserved in the People's Army of Bulgaria till March 1946, and in those of Hungary, Rumania and Czechoslovakia till 1948. Many officers in those armies belonged to classes alien to the proletariat and were unfit for commanding functions in armies of the new type. The content and system of political education did not fully correspond to the new tasks of the socialist revolution. The reactionary forces in the ministries of defence, and the officers who had formerly served in the bourgeois armies, adopted a hostile attitude towards Party-political work, towards the Communist commanders and political workers. Defending the slogan of an army outside of politics, the reactionaries attempted to preserve and consolidate their positions, to restore in the army a system typical of the armies of capitalist states.

To prevent armed action by the counter-revolutionaries, the working class, at the initiative and under the leadership of the Communist and Workers' Parties, created special armed detachments, which were manned according to the class principle by revolutionary workers and peasants fully devoted to the socialist cause. These were the national security forces and the state militia, as well as the workers' militia, that is, the armed workers' detachments set up at factories, mines, etc. The workers' militia and the national security forces played a decisive role in preventing armed action by the counter-revolutionaries in Czechoslovakia in February 1948.

In 1945-1946, in Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Rumania and Czechoslovakia, the bourgeois parties, which then formed part of the national fronts, sought permission to set up their organisations in the armies in order to demoralise the soldiers politically, to support reactionary officers and to strengthen their influence in the army. To prevent this, the governments, at the initiative of the Communist Parties, permitted the activity only of organisations of the national fronts in the armies. Under these conditions the leadership of the armed forces and the education of the personnel was effected by the Communist Parties. The Communists, who headed the national fronts, were able, through the leading bodies and the governments of the national fronts, to guide the armed forces development, determine the content and the forms of political work, train

and appoint the commanders of working class and peasant origin, purge the armed forces of reactionary officers, etc.

On December 22, 1944 an army of the new type was formed in Vietnam. Formed by the Communist Party of Indochina in the course of the armed struggle against the Japanese colonialists, the People's Army of Vietnam fought a heroic national liberation, revolutionary war for almost eight years against the French colonialists and internal reactionaries who were representing the interests of the landowners and comprador bourgeoisie. After they had vanquished the enemy, the working people of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam launched the building of socialist society. Simultaneously, the army was further developed in political and military-technical respects.

For many years now, the Vietnamese people and its People's Army have, with the support of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, been heroically fighting US aggression. The US army and the army of the US puppets have been suffering defeat in Vietnam.

In the Korean People's Democratic Republic an army of the new type was created in 1948. It was formed of the guerilla detachments organised by the Communist Party during the Korean people's struggle against the Japanese invaders.

In the grim war imposed on the Korean people by US imperialism and the Syngman Rhee reactionary regime, the Korean People's Army proved its high morale and battle-worthiness and acquired considerable combat experience.

The formation of armies of the new type had a number of specific features in the Hungarian People's Republic and in the German Democratic Republic, too. The old, fascist armies of Hungary and Germany were routed by the Soviet Army. An important form of military assistance to the revolutionary forces of these countries by the Soviet Armed Forces was the prevention by them of the export of counter-revolution to the HPR and the GDR. The working people of these countries were therefore able to implement revolutionary transformations even before they had created armies of the new type.

True, in Hungary the formation of the Republic's army was begun in 1945, that is, while the democratic revolution was still in progress. But, before 1947 it could not be con-

sidered as being fully an army of the new type. The bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties, who had the majority in Parliament and in the government, took over the Ministry of Defence and appointed a large number of reactionary officers to commanding positions. These officers did everything in their power to stop the Communists from carrying on political and educational work in the army, wanted to make the army a counter-revolutionary force.

After the reactionary parties in the country and the government had been defeated, the Communists, relying on the decisive support by the rank-and-file and democratic officers, introduced and directed the reforms aimed at restructuring the army into an army of the socialist type.

The National People's Army was formed in the German Democratic Republic in 1956, when the building of socialist society was already in full swing. Therefore, this army was from the very beginning a socialist one as regards its functions, social composition, the principles underlying the political leadership and ideological education of the personnel. Prior to the formation of the National People's Army the function of the defence of the German Democratic Republic against imperialist aggressors was fulfilled by the Soviet Union and its Armed Forces, and also by other European socialist states and their armies.

The youngest of the armies of the socialist countries are the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Cuba. Their predecessors were the revolutionary workers' and peasants' guerilla detachments fighting the pro-American dictatorial regime of Batista.

The triumph of the anti-imperialist general democratic revolution in Cuba made it possible to launch socialist reforms in the country. As a result of these reforms, the revolutionary democratic army became an army of the socialist revolution. The constant threat from US imperialism and the numerous provocations of internal counter-revolutionaries made it necessary to set up armed detachments at enterprises, state farms and in co-operatives—a people's militia, which, alongside with the Revolutionary Armed Forces, vigilantly protects the gains of the Cuban people.

The formation of socialist armies in the People's Democracies was completed after the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship. Of decisive importance were the

substantial changes in the principles of the development of the armed forces, the training and education of the personnel, and also of the troop control, which were the result of a number of measures carried out at the initiative and under the leadership of the Communist and Workers' Parties. These measures consisted in the following:

(1) the placing of the Ministries of Defence under the leadership of the Communist Parties; the purge of the officer corps from elements hostile to socialist reforms; the appointment to commanding posts in large and small units of officers from among workers, peasants and the people's intelligentsia;

(2) the transformation of the national front bodies for cultural and educational work into Party-political bodies;

3 the permission by legislation for organisations of the Communist and Workers' Parties to carry on their activities in large and small units; the definition of their rights and duties in the struggle for the political cohesion of the personnel, for raising the combat readiness of the armed forces, for educating the soldiers in the spirit of the defence of the socialist revolutions in the socialist countries, in the spirit of the Marxist-Leninist ideology;

(4) the granting of greater authority to the political workers, the assignment to them of rights and duties equal to those of the commanders in dealing with problems affecting the life, combat training and political education in large and small units;

5 the drafting and introduction of new laws on the armed forces, of regulations and manuals, corresponding to the principles of the development, education and discipline in armies of the new type, to the military science of the socialist state.

Development of the Armies of the Socialist States Today

The course of the socialist construction in the People's Democracies has wrought major changes in their armed forces.

Proceeding from the Leninist principle that all military development in a socialist state should be based on the leadership of the armed forces by the Communist Party, the fraternal Parties in the socialist countries have introduced a number of important measures. In all socialist states, including those in which there are several parties, the Com-

munist and Workers' Parties are effecting the undivided leadership and control over the armed forces. The role and influence of the Party organisations in the armies of the socialist countries have risen considerably and Party-political work has been improved.

The intensification of the Party leadership in the socialist armies takes into account the specific features of the armed forces and of the country's development. For example, in the Hungarian People's Army, the Party leadership is carried out not by political bodies, but by elected Party committees. These and other specific features are explained by differences in the level of the theoretical training and experience of the commanders and political workers, and by the prevailing traditions in the organisation of Party-political work.

A crucial factor in the development of the socialist armies is the replacement of officers who formerly served in the bourgeois armies by well-trained officers from among workers, peasants and the people's intelligentsia. Thus, in the National People's Army of the GDR nine-tenths of the officers were in the past workers and peasants, one-tenth—members of the people's intelligentsia. Most of the officers are members of the Marxist-Leninist Party. In the Bulgarian People's Army 85 per cent of the officers are members of the Bulgarian Communist Party, while in the Polish Army 75 per cent of the officers are members of the Polish United Workers' Party. The following figures illustrate the level of the military and technical training of the officer corps: in the pre-war Polish Army only 5 per cent of the officers had a higher military education, in the present Polish Army 25 per cent of the officers have a higher education.

Enormous changes have taken place also in the composition of the non-commissioned officers and privates. A large part of the young people joining the army have a secondary or incomplete secondary education. The political awareness of the non-commissioned officers and privates has also grown substantially.

The commanders in the armed forces of the socialist countries rely on the collective wisdom and authority of the Party organisations, on their ability to mobilise and direct the energy of the soldiers. *While there are certain differences in the forms of organisation and in the methods*

of leadership in the various armed forces, they all have the following in common—the social and ideological unity of the personnel, the unity of military-theoretical views, the leading and guiding role of the Marxist-Leninist Parties.

Much attention is given to strengthening the links between the army and the people. Although these links take different forms, the most important among them are the participation of the soldiers in socialist construction and the participation of the working people in the strengthening of the country's defences. When off-duty, soldiers help the working people in the factories and in the agricultural producer co-operatives to develop the socialist economy. In turn the working people actively promote the improvement of the armed forces. Detachments of the people's militia have been set up in Czechoslovakia, of workers' militia in Hungary, of armed workers in the GDR, and people's volunteer corps in some other countries.

A regularity in the development of socialist armies is the consolidation of their mutual links within the framework of the socialist community.

As we noted above, an irreversible process of erosion is at work in the imperialist blocs; the contradictions between the countries participating in those blocs deepen and intensify, and the working masses struggle against the participation in imperialist blocs of all kinds, against all forms of subordination to the US diktat in those blocs.

Conversely, in the Warsaw Treaty countries the further consolidation of the socio-political unity of the working class, the co-operated peasantry and the people's intelligentsia on the basis of the full victory of socialist relations of production, the extension of economic co-operation, of the international socialist division of labour and the co-operation of production, form the objective factors promoting the development of the socio-political and economic basis for the military co-operation between the peoples and the armed forces of the socialist states. The community of political aims and ideology, faithfulness to the Marxist-Leninist teaching and to proletarian internationalism, and the improvement of the organisational forms for the consolidation of the unity of the fraternal Parties, states, peoples and armies are the subjective factors for the further strengthening of the Warsaw Treaty.

In the face of the growing aggressive actions by the imperialist forces the mechanism of the Warsaw Treaty is growing stronger. The armies of the Warsaw Treaty countries are equipped with the most up-to-date weapons. In field training, in the air and at sea, co-operation practice between the armed forces of the allied states is developed, the power of modern weapons is tested and the fraternity of the armed forces of the Warsaw Pact countries is strengthened. Very important in this respect were the joint exercises *October Storm* in the GDR, the *Ultava* exercises in Czechoslovakia, the *Rodopy* exercises in Bulgaria and others.

The consolidation of the unity and military might of the Warsaw Treaty is important not only for the joint defence of the gains of the socialist countries. The powerful defensive weapons of these states, which are forged by the collective efforts of the peoples of the socialist community, are at the same time weapons of freedom for those waging an armed struggle against imperialism, are a bulwark of peace for those fighting to avert a new world war.

Relations of equality, sovereignty and the independence of the socialist states and their armies are the prerequisite for genuine collectivity in the joint discussion of all essential issues. Collective discussions help to work out the most effective decisions, to prevent mistakes and promote a better mutual understanding between the state and military leaders of the Warsaw Treaty member-countries.

The education of the soldiers of the fraternal armies in the spirit of the indestructible ideological and military collaboration with the Soviet Armed Forces is indissolubly linked with the mastery and creative use of the advanced experience of the Soviet Army and the principles of Soviet military science, on which the development of the military science of all the other socialist states is based. In turn Soviet servicemen study the experience in combat training and political education gained by the fraternal armies carefully and deeply, and take into account their achievements in the development of military theory and practice.

The experience in the development of the armies of the socialist countries clearly shows that the essential distinctions in the principles, forms and methods of this development, which were more or less pronounced at the beginning of the organisation of the armies of the new type, are now

losing their importance and are disappearing; and that common regularities are asserting themselves ever more strongly, regularities stemming from the socialist nature of the social system, the social, political and ideological unity of the peoples in the socialist community.

4. MATERIAL AND SPIRITUAL BASES OF THE SUPREMACY OF THE SOCIALIST MILITARY ORGANISATION

The historical supremacy of the socialist military organisation is an objective and logical phenomenon. It is conditioned by the entire course of historical development, by the dynamics of the alignment of forces in the world which is constantly changing in favour of progress, and by the historically inevitable victory of socialism and communism. This supremacy has been proved in practice by the glorious history of the Soviet Armed Forces, it has been confirmed by the entire experience of the military development in the countries of the socialist community.

Objective Prerequisites for the Supremacy of the Socialist Military Organisation

The more than half-century that has passed since the Great October Socialist Revolution has convincingly demonstrated that the victory of socialism in a single country was an inevitable result of the laws of social development. It proved the correctness of the scientific theory and programme of the proletarian revolution worked out by Lenin and by the Party created by him. This programme corresponded to the objective historically-matured requirements of social development, the vital interests of the popular masses in Russia and those of the vast majority of the world population. It is for these reasons that the socialist programme and the peace-loving policy of the Soviet state could firmly rely on the broadest support of the popular masses in the USSR and in other countries, and notably on the active support and solidarity of the international proletariat. The Great October Socialist Revolution thus had a world-wide basis, one much broader than that possessed by any other revolution before it.

The first attack by the imperialist aggressors on the Soviet Union demonstrated that war against a socialist state

is dangerous not only to the armies of the aggressors, but also to the whole capitalist social system, to the monopoly bourgeoisie's political power. The Armed Forces of the young Soviet Republic, defending the humane ideas of peace and progress, turned out to be invincible even though the aggressive military machine of the imperialists facing them was superior in strength. The country was surrounded by imperialist powers which were much stronger in economic and military respects, but they, Lenin said, could not carry out their intention of directly and immediately stifling Soviet Russia. "Materially—economically and militarily," Lenin said, "we are extremely weak; but morally—by which, of course, I mean not abstract morals, but the alignment of the real forces of all classes in all countries—we are the strongest of all. This has been proved in practice; it has been proved not merely by words but by deeds; it has been proved once and, if history takes a certain turn, it will, perhaps, be proved many times again."[1]

The October Revolution made the Soviet Republic strong not only in moral-political respects, but created conditions to raise it to a higher stage in economic, socio-political and scientific respects. This created the necessary and decisive conditions for the supremacy of the socialist military organisation over the military organisation of the imperialist states.

The supremacy and invincibility of the military organisation of the socialist type directly reflect the objective law of the inevitable victory of the new progressive social system that is replacing the old, reactionary social system.

Throughout history the military organisation of the emergent social system proved victorious in the end. The progressive development of human society would be impossible if reactionaries could always suppress the new social system by means of armed violence. The social revolution of the emergent class, born by the historical necessity of creating new relations of production, inevitably triumphs over the armed violence applied by the reactionary classes. History shows that the armed resistance of the working class is always victorious in the end, because it relies on a higher socio-economic organisation, on the most advanced social

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 151.

class. "... The revolution triumphs if it brings to the forefront the advanced class which strikes effectively at exploitation", directs all its efforts at the extermination of the oppressor class and the economic conditions for the existence of that class. "Force can be used even if those who resort to it have no economic roots, but in that case, history will doom it to failure. But force can be applied with the backing of the advanced class, relying on the loftier principles of the socialist system, order and organisation. *In that case, it may suffer temporary failure, but in the long run it is invincible.*"[1]

The invincibility of the socialist military organisation and its supremacy over the imperialist military organisation are a direct result of the supremacy of the socialist social system over the bourgeois in material and spiritual respects. In economic respects the supremacy of socialism over capitalism, its historical invincibility is secured primarily by the socialist system of economy, by socialist ownership of the means of production. The socialist economic system secures higher growth rates of the productive forces and a higher labour productivity and, in the final analysis this, Lenin pointed out, is the most important, the principal thing for the victory of the new social system.

The socialist mode of production pursues the aim of achieving the greatest possible welfare for all members of society. It is characterised by the planned, proportionate development of the economy, ensures high growth rates for the material and technical basis of the country's defensive capability, a fundamentally new social basis of the armed forces. The socialist mode of production makes it possible to create and develop a qualitatively higher, more efficient type of modern military organisation, to mobilise the greatest amount of resources necessary for the conduct of war, to secure the highest combat efficiency and morale in the armed forces and invincible staunchness and endurance in the popular masses at the front and in the rear throughout the war. The working people in town and country and not landowners and capitalists, become the masters of their country and are therefore interested in political, as well as material respects in defending their revolutionary gains,

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, pp. 371, 374.

willingly make any sacrifices, perform deeds of mass heroism, bravery and courage, firmness and fearlessness in combat.

After the triumph of the October Revolution and the formation of the world socialist system the development of many countries is guided by the internal laws of the new mode of production. The sphere of operation of these laws extends with the successes of world socialism, while the sphere of the action of the laws of capitalism is shrinking. All this has a telling effect on social and military development.

The basis making the socialist military organisation invincible is extended and consolidated not only by new breaks in the imperialist chain brought about by socialist revolutions, but also by the disintegration of the colonial system of imperialism, by the upsurge of the national liberation struggle.

One of the most important reasons for the invincibility and supremacy of the military organisation of the socialist states is the international character of the aims pursued by the latter, and hence of the aims they achieve in the wars against imperialist aggressors. Therefore, in addition to the internal unity and cohesion of socialist society, its power and invincibility rest upon the international community of its interests and aims with those of the working people of all countries, upon the international cohesion of socialist society with the revolutionary and progressive forces opposing imperialism throughout the world.

The Soviet state, having implemented radical socio-economic and political transformations in the course of socialist construction, has created an aggregate of economic, scientific, moral and military possibilities for the conduct of war, which no other state has ever possessed. Relying on Soviet experience, this road has been taken also by the other countries of the socialist community.

Subjective Conditions for the Realisation of the Advantages of Socialism in the Interests of Victory

The historical invincibility of the military organisation of the socialist type is conditioned primarily by the objective laws of social development, but the subjective factors born of the new socialist social relations also have a major role to play. The socialist social and state system creates the stable socio-political conditions, on which the

political and military leadership relies in carrying out measures to strengthen the country's defences and secure victory over the enemy in the war. The victory over the aggressive armed forces of the imperialist states is achieved by the comprehensive and efficient mobilisation of the objective and subjective factors promoting victory, of the physical and spiritual energy of the peoples of the socialist states, the officers and men of their armed forces.

The experience of the first socialist state in the world has shown that the transformation of the material and spiritual possibilities of victory into reality is an extremely complex creative process, in which the decisive role belongs to the conscious activity of many millions of people, to the organisational and ideological work of the Communist Party, the Soviet Government and the military command. The Communist Party inculcates ideas of the defence of the socialist country in the Soviet people and thereby ensures the all-sided development of the subjective factors securing victory in the war. It creates the conditions which make it possible to use the material and spiritual possibilities of the socialist state at the proper time, to mobilise the moral, economic and military might of the country for the purpose of routing imperialist aggressors. The military ideological education of the people ensures the opportune transformation of the country into a single military camp, the firm unity of rear and front during the war.

The Marxist-Leninist teaching shows that the military ideology of imperialism is historically fallacious and that the victory of the socialist military organisation over the bourgeois organisation is an objective law. Only Marxism-Leninism makes possible a scientific cognition of the laws of war as a social phenomenon and thereby reveals the scientifically based ways of achieving victory in the struggle of the two opposing military systems and the objectively logical prospects for the inevitable victory of the military organisation of the socialist states. The application of the Marxist-Leninist theory for the solution of socio-political and military-technical problems of the conduct of war, for working out a single military doctrine, gives effective results, secures the supremacy of the socialist military doctrine and military science over its bourgeois counterparts. Marxism-Leninism is the most powerful ideological weapon of the

Party and the people in the military field. It is no less important in military questions than it is in socio-political questions, it is the most important prerequisite for the invincibility of the socialist military organisation.

The victory of the Soviet Union in the Great Patriotic War was an incontestable proof of the viability of Lenin's ideas, of the historical invincibility of the socialist state and its Armed Forces. The results of the war have convincingly demonstrated that there are no forces in the world capable of crushing socialism, placing on its knees a people faithful to the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, devoted to its socialist country, closely rallied round its Party. These results are a stern warning to the imperialist aggressors, a grim and unforgettable historical lesson to them.

The fact that the Soviet people now live for the third decade in conditions of peace and are able to dedicate their powers to the building of communism shows that the defence of the USSR is reliable. The invincible military might of the Soviet state is embodied in the high combat efficiency and morale of its Armed Forces, in their combat readiness and their willingness decisively to rout any imperialist aggressor.

The further strengthening of the might of the Soviet military organisation depends on how skilfully and effectively the military cadres are able to use the growing possibilities of science, technology and weaponry, how fully the training and education of the personnel of the Armed Forces corresponds to modern demands, on how fully Soviet military theory is embodied in military practice.

* * *

Thus, the armed forces of the socialist states are the main weapon for the defence of the new system's achievements. As regards their socio-political essence and historical purpose they are an organ of the socialist state, and the Marxist-Leninist Parties are their leading and organising force. While each of the socialist armies is marked by specific forms as regards its emergence, formation, national traditions and customs, the main role is played by common development features. The community of the fraternal armies is conditioned by the fact that they have an economic and

political system of the same type, a common ideology and common aims and tasks.

The unity of the armies of the socialist states finds a vivid expression in their military co-operation in the form of the Warsaw Treaty and the bilateral agreements on friendship, co-operation and mutual assistance. The Marxist-Leninist Parties give unflagging attention to the further consolidation of the military co-operation of the socialist states.

The supremacy of the socialist military organisation is inherent in the very nature of socialism, in the character and specific features of the armies of the new type. Relying on the objective prerequisites of that supremacy, the Soviet soldiers tirelessly raise the military might of the Army and Navy in order always to be ready to smash any aggressor.

Chapter Six

THE MILITARY POWER OF THE STATE IN CONTEMPORARY CONDITIONS

In the preceding chapters we looked into the key problems of the Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and the army—investigated war as a socio-political phenomenon, the conditions and causes for the emergence of wars, especially in the contemporary epoch, the laws governing the emergence and development of the armed forces set up by classes and states for waging wars, and some other problems. But these questions do not exhaust the subject-matter of the teaching about war and the army. The Marxist-Leninist teaching makes a theoretical analysis also of the dependence of the course and outcome of wars on economic and other social conditions, reveals the main regularities underlying the formation of the military might of states and the combat power of their armies. The theoretical and practical solution of the last group of questions is of great political and military importance.

1. THE CONCEPT OF THE STATE'S MILITARY POWER

The military power of the state (coalition) is a relative notion. To obtain an idea of the military power of a definite state (coalition) it must be compared with the might of other states (coalitions). The opposing side also

has a certain military power, which it applies to achieve its aims. Therefore victory and defeat of the warring states (coalitions), the course and the outcome of wars, depends on the whole directly on the correlation of their military power.

Dependence of the Course and Outcome of Wars on the Military Power of the Warring Sides

The dependence of the course and outcome of war on the correlation between the military power of the warring sides, analysed in its dynamic state and taking into account the character of the political aims of the sides, is a general law of war. Its operation is linked with the more general laws of social development, but at the same time has a vividly expressed independence of them. Stable and necessary connections and relations mark the correlation between the forces of the warring sides in the course of the attainment by them of their military-political aims and the decisive processes of the war, i.e., the methods by which it is conducted, the main trends in the development of the armed struggle, its results, the ability of the troops to wage offensive and defensive actions, etc. The efforts of the economy, science, moral possibilities and so on also exert a telling effect on the belligerents' strength.

The decisive importance of the correlation between the military power (forces) of the warring countries to the fate of the war is inherent in the very nature of social relations, since all social development takes the form of an interaction between individuals, collectives, social groups, parties and classes. Since there are different forms of ownership in individual countries and in the world at large, for example, the capitalist and socialist—this interaction is ultimately reduced to an interaction of diametrically opposed socio-political forces. This is clearly proved by the main content of our epoch: the revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism, which is proceeding on the basis of a fundamental change in the alignment of the social forces in the world, which to an ever higher degree coincides with the main trend of historical progress, with the interests of the working masses.

Obviously, war is the sharpest form assumed by the clash of the socio-political forces. Each fighting side attempts to defend its economic and military-political interests with

the help of violent means. Therefore, all of the social life of the belligerents is influenced by violence during a war, and the consequences depend on the amount and the quality of the means applied. This relation of the armed forces is in its turn a result of the relation of the socio-economic and political forces of the warring sides, and is determined by the aims for the sake of which military power is applied.

However, supremacy in military power only makes victory possible. Even a great supremacy in the military power of a definite state (coalition) over its opponent does by no means guarantee victory. It only provides the state (the coalition) with favourable possibilities for the achievement of victory. The transformation of that possibility into reality is a highly creative process. The decisive role in it is played by the conscious activity of the many millions of people, of classes, parties, special organisations (the armed forces) and, naturally, individuals. The nature of the leadership of the masses and the social forces, who translate the possibility of victory into reality, is ultimately decided by the country's social system and political organisation, by their correspondence to the progressive tendencies of historical development.

While success in war between states depends on the correlation of their military power, on the ability of the military and political leadership of each side to create and realise this relation in its favour, every concrete act of war—battle, operation or action—are determined by their concrete relation of forces. For example, the specific features of the Stalingrad battle were determined by the relation of forces both on the entire Soviet-German front, and also by that on the sector between the Volga and the Don.

The transition from military actions on a minor scale to hostilities on a major scale, is at the same time a transition from one level in the relation of forces to another. There is a certain dependence between these levels. It is expressed by the fact that the alignment of the forces on a tactical scale is part of the more general relation of forces —that marking military actions on an operational scale, which in their turn are a definite aspect of the relation between the strategical forces. As regards the relation of

the military forces of the warring states (coalitions), it acts as part of a more general relation of the forces of states, namely, as a relation of their economic and socio-political forces.

Although inseparably bound together, these different levels in the relation of forces lose none of their relative independence. In the course of military actions a situation may shape in which there can be a favourable relation of forces on a particular sector while the relation as a whole is unfavourable, and vice versa.

While remaining relatively independent and at the same time linked in a definite way, the various levels of the relation of forces, each in its own way and all together, determine the course and outcome of the war, and the trend of the state's military policy in peacetime. In pursuing definite political and military aims, each state is concerned with its military power, strives to improve it by taking into account the military power of its probable opponent, who also does not mark time.

The military power of the state as a correlative magnitude expresses the degree of its ability to wage a war against other states by straining all the material and spiritual forces of society. It is expressed in the material and spiritual possibilities the given state (coalition) has at its disposal and which are embodied directly in the armed forces, in their ability to wage military operations. These possibilities are conditioned by the socio-economic and political system in the country, by the level of development of the productive forces, the state's political line and other factors.

Military power can be pictured as a system of a definite structure, each of the elements of which holds a definite place, and all of which are interlinked and mutually determined. It includes the economic, scientific, moral-political and particularly the military potentials, which have quantitative and qualitative aspects. The economic potential is the basis of a country's military power. The moral potential permeates all the elements of the military power and decisively determines the degree to which they are utilised. The military potential expresses directly the defensive power of the country; the scientific potential, on the other hand, being relatively independent, is realised

through all other potentials and serves as one of the motive forces for their development and interrelation.

The potentials and their elements, being actuated in connection with a possible attack by an opponent or in the course of war, become factors, that is, motive forces, conditions of victory or defeat. Therefore, the factors determining the course and outcome of war are the economy, science, the morale of the people and the army, weapons, nowadays mainly nuclear ones, etc. Their quality and quantity, the role of each, are historically conditioned.

Such is our viewpoint on the military power of the state (coalition). It corresponds to the materialist conception of history and the recognition of dialectical social development, and in this lies its advantage over the views of the military theoreticians of imperialism.

This naturally does not mean that the imperialist theoreticians ignore the key components of the military power of the state (coalition). They give their due to the economic, scientific and moral potentials, and naturally to the armed forces. For example, the Field Service Regulations of the US Army read: "*Elements of National Power.* All the means (political, economic, military, and psychological) which are available for employment in the pursuit of national objectives."[1]

The similarity in the definition of the military power and its components is only superficial. American and other writers on military matters give a different evaluation notably to the socio-political, moral components. Relying on unscientific methodological foundations, they exaggerate some and underestimate other elements of the military power of the state (coalition). For example, the US military theoretician K. Knorr reduced military power to the productive possibilities of the state and belittled all other components. Many military theoreticians overestimate the military potential as such, especially that of the nuclear missiles. They maintain that the nuclear power of the USA and the NATO bloc is much higher than that of the USSR and believe that a single nuclear strike will suffice to destroy the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

---

[1] *Field Service Regulations*, p. 3.

These and similar considerations completely ignore the historical approach to the evaluation of the military power of states.

Causes of Changes in the Military Power of States

Historically, the military power of every state does not remain constant but changes under the influence of a number of socio-political and military-technical factors. For example, the military power of the Soviet Union on the eve of the Second World War and its military power at present differ considerably in quantitative as well as in qualitative respects. The military power of the imperialist states has changed too.

The most important circumstances that have conditioned the change in the military power of states, have fundamentally altered their components and thus influenced the new relation of military forces in the world today, are the following:

First, the radical change in the alignment of forces in the contemporary world. Marx, Engels and Lenin showed that the scientific criterion of a genuinely historical approach to phenomena *consists in an objectively scientific analysis of the relations of classes at every given historical moment.* Lenin wrote: "Marxism requires of us a strictly exact and objectively verifiable analysis of the relations of classes and of the concrete features peculiar to each historical situation. We Bolsheviks have always tried to meet this requirement, which is absolutely essential for giving a scientific foundation of policy."[1] Hence, a genuinely historical approach and consideration of the relation of classes and the relation of military power are two aspects of the same question. *The relation of social forces in the world and the relation of the military power of states are interconnected and mutually conditioned. What is initial, basic, is the relation of the social forces in the world.*

At the back of the change in the relation of forces between the individual countries is the general regrouping in the relation of the social, class forces in the world. This arises out of the main process of modern times—the revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism—and is linked with the concurrent disintegration of the colonial

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, p. 43.

system and the growth of the national liberation movement, and also of the working-class and communist movement in the capitalist countries. In this connection the relation of forces in the world continues to change in favour of socialism, the working-class and the national liberation movement. Imperialism has been unable to change that in spite of all its attempts to do so.

However, one should not oversimplify the approach to that matter. We speak here of the main tendency of social development, of its trend, and do not aver that the capitalist system has become so weak that we need no longer reckon with its possibilities. The economic potentialities of the capitalist system are still rather high. They are contained in its production possibilities, in the internal interrelations and in the influence which imperialist economy, politics and ideology still exert on the developing countries.

The question of the changes of the social forces in the field of political relations is also complicated. In the general stream of the national liberation struggle in the various Asian, African and Latin American countries the influence of the capitalist countries is still great, and the internal counter-revolutionary forces rely on it. They fight the national liberation struggle jointly, induce some countries to turn to the Right and to be caught in the snares spread for them by the reactionary imperialist circles.

While the upsurge of the class, revolutionary struggle of the working class and the working people in the capitalist countries is the basic trend, account must be taken of the fact that at certain periods we observe definite recession in that trend.

These and other social processes affect primarily the economic and moral potentials of states (coalitions), influence their military power and the relation of forces between them.

Secondly, an all-embracing influence on social life is exerted by the development of the productive forces and the scientific and technological progress linked with it, and, in modern conditions, by the scientific and technological revolution. This revolution has wrought an upheaval in the technological development of many countries, has changed industry and agriculture, made the latter resemble industry, and considerably raised labour productivity.

Favourable conditions have been created for intensive technological development and the introduction of scientific research in all spheres of social life, including military affairs.

The scientific and technological revolution, mediated by the socio-political system of states, exerts an impact on their military power. It has affected the character of their economic and moral potential, advanced the scientific potential to the foreground, has become one of the sources of the revolution in the military field, and wrought qualitative changes in the military potential.

Thirdly, the military power of states (coalitions) forms under the influence of the radical changes in the means of the armed struggle and, in our days, under the decisive influence of nuclear weapons and new means for their delivery. It is commonly known that the creation of these weapons, and the equipment with them of the Soviet Armed Forces, affected the world strategic situation enormously. The nuclear potential of the imperialists is confronted by the nuclear missile power of the USSR, a reliable bulwark of peace, democracy and socialism. It is precisely for this reason that stockpiles of nuclear weapons of different designation have been created and that all the services of the Soviet Armed Forces have been increasingly equipped with means for their employment. The strategic rocket troops and atomic submarines, which are the main means of deterring the aggressor and of routing him in war, rapidly increased in strength.

As in the past, the character and the outcome of the future war will be determined by the general relation of forces. In case of a nuclear war, decisive importance will be acquired by the relation of nuclear forces and means, as well as by the individual elements of the nuclear power of the sides, that is, the nuclear stockpiles, the quality and quantity of the means for their delivery to target, the efficiency and accuracy of hit. Thus, the struggle for military-technical supremacy has now become decisive.

Fourthly the change in the military power is conditioned by the socio-political and military-technical character of a possible war. The decisive political aims pursued by states with opposing socio-political systems in the war, will also require considerable material and spiritual efforts on the

part of the belligerents the military-political aims enormous as regards their importance and scale require that there be a big and effective war machine In turn nuclear missile weapons and means for their rapid delivery make it possible today to resolve tasks which could not even be set in the past Mass nuclear missile strikes at the armed forces of the opponent and at his key economic and political objectives can determine the victory of one side and the defeat of the other at the very beginning of the war Therefore a correct estimate of the elements of the supremacy over the opponent and the ability to use them before the opponent does are the key to victory in such a war

The above circumstances make it possible to draw the conclusion that at present the concept 'military power' has become more inclusive and much deeper It has become more inclusive because it now embraces not only individual states but also their alliances and coalitions In evaluating the military power of a state it is essential to consider also its relations with the main groupings of states in the world and its contribution to the aggregate military power Particular attention must be focussed on the characteristic of the military power of the two world systems—the socialist and the imperialist The role played in these systems by the two superpowers—the USSR and the USA—must also be taken into account

The concept 'military power' of a state (coalition) has become deeper The emergence of socialism as a social system has convincingly refuted the views of people who proceeded only from the military aspect while appraising the relation of the forces of states The growth of the forces and possibilities of the socialist system has made it necessary to supplement the purely military evaluation of the relation of forces of states with the evaluation of the possibilities of their socio-political systems and the morale of their peoples At the Second Congress of Soviets in 1917, Lenin noted that our conception of force differs from that of the bourgeoisie 'Our idea' he said, is that a state is strong when the people are politically conscious It is strong when the people know everything can form an opinion of everything and do everything consciously [1] Therefore

[1] V I Lenin *Collected Works* Vol 26 p 256

the power of the state is composed of the possibilities of its social, class structure its economic, scientific, moral-political and military potentials

2 ECONOMIC FOUNDATIONS OF THE STATE S MILITARY POWER

Having evolved the materialist theory of the historical process, Marx and Engels considered military phenomena in their relation to the general course of social development From these positions they made a comprehensive analysis of the causes underlying the victories and defeats of the belligerents in numerous wars, focussing attention on a study of the course and outcome of wars of which they were contemporaries. Marx and Engels took into account the role played in the outcome of the war by the morale of the army, by weapons and military skill. But they considered economic conditions most important to any solution of the question about the causes of victories and defeats, since they, in the final analysis, determine the military aspect

Dependence of the Course and Outcome of War on Economic Conditions

The proposition that the military power of states depends on economic conditions refers to all epochs and expresses one of the most important laws of the course and outcome of the war. In laying the foundation for this, the only correct viewpoint, Engels sharply criticised the then prevailing theory that the course and outcome of wars depend not on economic development, but are determined only 'by the free will of the generals". Engels countered this theory by formulating the law that "... the whole organisation and method of warfare, and along with these victory or defeat, prove to be dependent on material, that is, economic conditions: on the human material and the armaments material, and therefore on the quality and quantity of the population and on technical development".[1]

Indeed, even in the period when only side-arms were used in wars, the outcome of battles depended on the level attained by the production of these arms A steel sword,

[1] F Engels *Anti-Duhring* Moscow 1969 p 205

sh eld, helmet, armour, chain mail—all this presupposed a comparatively high level of development of the crafts.

The transition from side-arms to fire weapons their improvement, the creation of artillery—all this raised the role played by the economy in the course and outcome of war

The above, however, does not mean that the outcome of every war can be directly explained by the relation between the economic development levels of the warring states. The course and outcome of wars are also substantially affected by a number of other factors—the population figure, geographic position, international relations, etc The economy, therefore, predetermines the outcome of the war both directly and also through intermediary links and circumstances only in the long run.

Marx's and Engels's views on military questions, their postulate that the course and outcome of wars depend on economic conditions, were creatively developed by Lenin He proved that in the new historical epoch the dependence of the course and outcome of wars on economic and sociopolitical conditions increases enormously. "Never before has the military organisation of a country had such a close bearing on its entire economic and cultural system,"[1] he wrote.

But Lenin did not confine himself to the creative development of the Marxist propositions about the conditions that determine the outcome of wars in the modern epoch Most important in his military theoretical heritage is his daring and scientific programme for military development in the socialist state. A central place in this programme is held by the idea that in the event of war the Soviet land must be turned into a single military camp in order to mobilise all the material and spiritual forces of the people for the rout of the enemy. The propositions in this programme were not only a new word in the Marxist teaching on war and the army, they revealed an entirely new approach to problems of contemporary military science.

Let us touch in passing on the role of the economy in the First and Second World Wars

[1] V I Lenin, *Collected Works* Vol. 8 p 52

Wars of the past, up to the First World War, were generally waged with the weapons and materials produced and accumulated before the beginning of military operations.

This was the case, for example, in the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71 when the expenditure of war materials and particularly of weapons was small: in eight months of the war the Germans expended an average of 40 rounds per rifle, and 190 shells per cannon. The expenditure of war materials grew considerably in the Russo-Japanese war when about a million shots were fired (720 shells per cannon). This expenditure of war materials was secured by the stocks accumulated in peace-time and by the output of the armaments and powder plants

Very different conditions shaped in the beginning of the First World War. The war materials produced in anticipation of that war were spent already in the first few months. All preliminary estimates of the General Staffs turned out to be quite unrealistic.

The General Staff of the Russian Army estimated that the requirement in shells in the imminent war would equal 1,000 per cannon and that a total of 7 million would be needed for the whole war. Actually, however, more than 55 million artillery and mortar shells were fired.

The German mobilisation plan provided for a monthly output of 330,000 shells and 10 000 rifles. Actually, however, a monthly production of up to 12 million shells and 250 000 rifles was needed This gross error was one of the causes for the failure of the German strategic plan in the war, the central idea of which was to inflict a quick destructive blow to France in order to smash her before the Russian Army could mobilise and mount actions In the decisive battle on the Marne River (September 1914) the Germans could not exploit their success mainly because of the shortage of war materials and tyres for their motor vehicles. Germany s industry, which had not been prepared in peacetime, was unable to fill advancing army's ever increasing material requirements in time.

It should be noted that the nazi strategists made a similar but even bigger blunder when they were preparing the war against the Soviet Union. Their plan provided for the destruction of the USSR in six weeks, which was to be

achieved with the armaments produced in Germany before the attack against the Soviet Union and with those seized in the occupied West European countries. The nazi leaders, therefore, had not provided for the maximum development of military production and for the improvement of equipment during the war against the USSR. When the Blitzkrieg plan was foiled by the Soviet Army and it became essential to produce up-to-date military equipment on a growing scale, time had been lost. nazi Germany was unable to develop arms production during the war on a scale necessary to satisfy the requirements of that war.

Thus, the two world wars vividly demonstrated the qualitatively new relation between the economy and war. Its most important feature was that it had become absolutely impossible to wage such wars relying (only) on the stockpiles of weapons and war materials created in peacetime, and on the current production of the war industry alone.

This was due to the following causes.

First, as a result of the enormous scale, intensity and duration of military operations and the density of fire, armaments were quickly destroyed or worn out. Therefore, the requirements for an uninterrupted replacement of losses in equipment and of the expenditure in materiel exceeded all the production reserves and the capacity of the war industry.

Second, in the course of these wars the belligerents competed intensively as regards the quantity and quality of armaments. Hence, it was not only necessary for industry to compensate for losses, but also constantly and rapidly to increase the quantity and improve the quality of all means of the armed struggle, for in these wars military equipment was not only deteriorating physically, but was also rapidly growing obsolete.

Only the warring side whose economy was able to fulfil these extremely complicated tasks could expect victory in these wars. These tasks could not be implemented without the mobilisation of the entire industry, transport, agriculture, all branches of the national economy and science, all material resources of the warring states. Total mobilisation depends, in its turn, on the economic system and political organisation of society.

Therefore, the qualitatively new relation between the economy and the course of military operations during the two world wars consisted in the fact that the course and outcome of the armed struggle depended largely on the economic possibilities of the warring sides, on how effectively they used these possibilities for developing the constantly growing mass production of the means of armed struggle in order to secure their military-technical supremacy over the opponent. In these wars economic victory was a material prerequisite for military victory The economy became a direct participant in the war, determining the strategic and operational possibilities at every stage.

Role of the Economy in Modern War

Modern conditions introduce many novel aspects in the question of the significance of the economy in war. The relationship between the economic possibilities and military power has become more comprehensive and deeper than it was before. We have to do here not only with quantitative changes, but notably with deep qualitative ones.

The further growth of the productive forces and the rapid improvement of the industrial equipment have enormously expanded the economic possibilities of waging wars. The United States of America needed a relatively short time to create considerable stocks of modern weapons A large part of the productive forces is used in the interests of the war machine, the means and resources are redistributed between the branches of production, and the achievements of science and technology are used to the full for the same purpose. Military production and military consumption comprise a most important part of the economy of the imperialist countries. The direct and indirect military expenditure of those countries grows with every passing year

The competition between the powers in the field of military equipment has led to a state of affairs in which this equipment has become extremely effective, but also extremely complex and exorbitantly expensive. According to US data, a B-58 heavy bomber costs 133 times more than did its predecessor in the Second World War. Experts consider that with every new generation the cost of weapons at least doubles as compared with their cost in the preceding gener-

ation Typical in this respect is that the US Defence Department spends 60 per cent of its budget on the material and technical supplies for the army, while the relative expenditure on armaments per serviceman has grown by 75 per cent between 1955 and 1964

The expenditure on the creation of conventional weapons and military equipment used on a large scale mainly in local wars is very high According to the American press, the overall military expenditure in all countries of the world has now reached the fantastic figure of $204 000 million a year [1]

The high cost of modern weapons in the USA and other capitalist countries is due not only to the complexity of their production but also to the fact that the industrial corporations, taking advantage of their monopoly position artificially inflate prices for military production

The material expenditure for production of the newest types of military equipment, first and foremost of missiles and nuclear weapons is astronomical Their production puts extremely high demands on industry and also on the further development of scientific and technological thought In present-day conditions only the biggest and economically most developed powers can afford to supply the armed forces with all the necessary means of struggle. Only a country possessing a powerful economic, scientific and technological basis is able to outdo its probable opponent in military-technical respects.

The role of economic conditions in modern war has not only grown considerably but has also changed essentially in comparison with the world wars of the past In a world nuclear war exclusive importance will be acquired by the stockpiles of nuclear warheads and the means for their delivery to target, notably of all sorts of missiles and other modern weapons. The importance of the stocks of basic materials, which are being accumulated already in peacetime, will also grow.

The CPSU defines the tasks facing the Soviet state in strict keeping with the new demands made on the preparation of the country for the repelling and foiling of imperialist aggression. While the country's economic develop-

[1] *U S Arms Control and Disarmament Agency World Military Expenditures 1970* Washington, 1971 p 1

ment plans have a peaceful character, they provide also for its military defence The socialist economy plays the decisive role in strengthening the military power of the Soviet Union.

Already in wars of the past the armed struggle (the course and outcome of which were to a high degree determined by the economic resources of the warring states) was conducted not only against the armed forces but to some extent also against the enemy's economic objectives This was done with the aim of undermining his power The most important means the warring states used to expand their economic resources and to destroy those of the opponent was to seize his territory and to enforce a blockade. The latter served to interfere with the communications (especially sea communications) of warring and neutral countries Beginning with the Second World War a major role was assigned also to the third method of influencing the economy of the opponents—aerial bombing However, as yet such bombings did not succeed in knocking any country out of the war.

In modern conditions the possibilities of undermining the economic potential of warring states have changed completely In addition to strategic missiles the deep rear of the enemy can also be hit by missiles of an operational-tactical designation, and also by missiles carried by aircraft and submarines, especially atomic-powered submarines

Missiles with nuclear warheads are able to paralyse entire industrial regions Therefore, at the very beginning of the war, after the first nuclear missile exchange a sharp and radical change may set in in the relation of the combatants economic potentials

Does all this mean that the economy, which plays a decisive role during the period of the preparation for nuclear war, will have no importance in the course of the war itself? Some bourgeois authors draw this conclusion irrespective of whether the future war will be a short or a long one, or of how it will begin For example, some military experts believe that in modern conditions vast manpower and also industrial and material resources are no longer decisive and that nuclear, especially thermonuclear weapons are therefore the only yardstick of a nation's military power. It is difficult to agree with this point of

view—the war may start as a conventional one and may only eventually grow into a nuclear one; the warring sides may under definite conditions be strong enough to wage a lengthy war and then its course and outcome will be enormously effected by the state of the combatants' economy. The important role of the economy in war has been stressed also by some bourgeois sociologists and military theoreticians. Thus, Lieutenant-Colonel Richard Wagner, a staff officer of the West German Bundeswehr, wrote about the decisive importance of the economic possibilities of the state, saying that "a statesman should be guided both by the laws of armed struggle and by economic laws", and "a soldier is obliged to take economic development into account".[1]

In all probability the war will not end with an exchange of annihilating nuclear missile strikes. Despite the heavy destruction some part of industrial enterprises and other economic objectives will survive. It is therefore very possible that the remaining enterprises will be engaged both in the production of weapons and in catering to the needs of the population who have survived the bombings and radiation.

Under these conditions decisive importance is acquired not only by the existing industrial potential of the warring coalitions, but also by their viability and mobility: the vulnerability of industry and communications, and the ability to restore industrial production in the course of the war.

Economic Potential

The ever growing significance of economic conditions to the course and outcome of wars, especially after the Second World War, which is connected with radical changes in the socio-political life of states, made it necessary to carry out a comprehensive analysis of the economic potential.

The economic potential of every state is the maximum possibility possessed by its national economy to secure the material requirements of society and also to produce everything necessary for the conduct of war. It is expressed by the volume of social production, by the rates of its growth, the character of the economic structure and the economic

[1] *Soldat und Technik*, Juni 1965, No. 6, S. 329.

laws of the country's development and by the extent to which they correspond to historical progress.

As applied to modern wars, to the possible nuclear war, the economic potential can be characterised by the following key factors.

Firstly, *the absolute volume of production of material means necessary to wage war,* which the given state is able to achieve by straining its powers to the maximum. We have in mind not only the realisation of the country's (coalition's) economic possibilities during the war, but also the possibility of securing *in advance* a rational utilisation of all potentialities. This is largely determined by a correct military-technical policy in peacetime. One can expend three times more resources but create only unnecessary things. Without a rational military-technical policy it is impossible to stand the colossal strain of war even with a wealth of resources.

The volume of military production is determined by: a the general structure of production, the level of development of all the branches of the national economy (industry, agriculture, transport), especially by the potential of heavy industry and, in the first place, of branches capable of producing modern military equipment; b the population figure, the cultural level and qualification of the workers and the engineering and technical personnel engaged in the national economy; c the labour productivity; the natural resources of the country; e, the size of material reserves and notably of strategic materials. The efficiency with which material and human resources are used for military production is directly determined by the character of the economic and political system of the given state.

Secondly the *economic mobility* of the given state, that is: (a) the rapidity with which the switchover from peacetime economy to a smoothly functioning war economy is effected; b the growth rate of the production of key items of military equipment c the rapidity with which new samples of military equipment and armaments are introduced into serial production. Economic mobility helps to *win time* in the competition with the opponent and often this provides a decisive advantage in the course of the war.

By its very nature the enormous productive apparatus of the national economy possesses a much greater inertia

than the rapidly changing demands put upon it by the armed struggle. The cumbersome economic machinery is often unable to change as quickly as military operations require. Therefore, the ability constantly and continuously to outstrip enemy countries in the satisfaction of new military demands is of crucial significance.

Thirdly, *the viability of the national economy, its effective defence*, especially that of industry and transport at a time when mass destruction weapons can be used against it. Economic viability is affected by: a the social organisation of production and the nature of the division of labour; the geographical distribution of key industrial centres and the vulnerability of communications; the ability to restore destroyed enterprises.

The development rates, mobility and viability of the economy are determined, first and foremost, by the specific features of the dominant system of relations of production and by the efficiency of the state's economic policy, and depend on the morale of the population, its willingness to support that policy.

In addition to the above characteristic of the economic potential, there exists the concept "military-economic potential". The economic potential expresses the possibility of the state (coalition) to satisfy all requirements of the war (the preparation for it and its conduct), while the military-economic potential has to do with the ability of the economy to secure the direct needs of the armed forces both in peace and wartime. Countries with approximately identical economic possibilities may have different military-economic potentials. This is determined primarily by the economic system, the socio-political conditions and the development of the material and technical basis.

Advantages of Socialist States in Utilising the Economic Potential

In their attempts to evaluate the economic potential of bourgeois and socialist countries many bourgeois theoreticians confine themselves to a mechanical comparison of figures characterising the production of articles and materials of strategic importance and belittle the possibilities of the socialist system in developing its economic potential and in using it in case of war.

Let us note that bourgeois economists are increasingly

beginning to understand the effectiveness of the planned socialist system in the development and use of economic resources. The US Professor Oscar Morgenstern wrote:

"We are completely misled when we comfort ourselves in the light of the figures giving *total* steel production. Or, we are scared less than we should be when we see how the total Russian steel output begins to creep up to our level. The use of the steel gives the significance to this information."[1] The Russians, Morgenstern added, use it ever more purposefully, ensure an increase in productive capacity and defensive needs, whereas in the USA steel is often used irrationally.

However, bourgeois economists are unable to understand the essence and advantages of the socialist mode of production, namely, that its development is determined by qualitatively different, specific laws and is effected in a different way—not spontaneously, but through the planned guidance by the state. This makes it possible successfully to resolve vitally important tasks of peaceful construction as well as to strengthen the defensive capacity of the country.

The operation of the economic laws of socialism secures unprecedented rates of economic development and makes it possible in case of war most fully to mobilise and utilise all the powers of the people and all the resources of the socialist republics for the rout of the enemy.

Conversely, the laws of the capitalist economy, the spontaneity and anarchy ruling the bourgeois economy, hamper the effective mobilisation of material resources for the conduct of war. True, the bourgeoisie attempts to remedy these shortcomings by a transition to state-monopoly capitalism, by state regulation of the economy, by programming its development, by attempts to co-ordinate the various levers for influencing the economy with a view to achieving the objectives of monopoly capital. But, while the measures taken by the bourgeois states are able in some degree to mitigate the difficulties in mobilising resources for military purposes, they cannot overcome them completely. At the

[1] Oscar Morgenstern, *The Question of National Defense*, New York, 1959, p. 195.

same time, however, we observe a process of integration, of a unification of efforts towards the creation and utilisation of modern means of armed struggle in the capitalist countries. This is a new phenomenon. It has economic, political and military roots which must be taken into account. This integration has a contradictory character. Its aim is in some measure to co-ordinate imperialist interests on an international scale and thereby to transcend inter-imperialist contradictions. But they cannot be removed because they are endemic in the capitalist system.

Let us give a few examples providing vivid proof of the supremacy of the socialist mode of production in the utilisation of the economic potential. During the Great Patriotic War the Soviet Union and its Armed Forces relied on much smaller productive capacities than did nazi Germany, which had at its disposal the economic potential of practically all of Europe. In 1940 the USSR smelted 18.3 million tons of steel while Germany and the countries she had occupied smelted 25 million tons. Owing to the occupation by the German troops of the country's southern areas, steel production in the USSR dropped to 9 million tons. Nazi Germany was able to expand her iron and steel industry and to use the metal of the occupied West European countries. As a result, in 1943, steel production in Germany and in the countries she had seized reached a total of 34.6 million tons.

Even under these difficult conditions the Soviet state, headed by the Communist Party, was able to make the comparatively smaller volume of productive capacities provide the front with larger quantities of military equipment (aircraft, tanks, guns and mortars) and war materials than nazi Germany and her satellites. The Soviet economy demonstrated its supremacy over the economy of the enemy and was a decisive factor in the victory over nazi Germany.

The advantages of the socialist system manifested themselves particularly strikingly in the rapidity with which the production of new kinds of military equipment was mastered and introduced into serial production. For example, the nazi military experts considered the introduction of the T-34 tank into a serial production a unique record. "The T-34," they wrote, "caused a sensation.... By creating an extremely successful and entirely new type of tank the Russians

made a big leap forward in the field of tank building. The sudden appearance of the new machine at the front produced a major effect."[1]

An even greater achievement was the creation and production in an extremely short time of the atom and later of the hydrogen bomb. Foreign experts were convinced that the USA would keep its nuclear monopoly for a long time and that for at least 20 years the Soviet Union would be unable to create its own atom bomb.

The creation in the Soviet Union of ballistic, global and anti-missile missiles had an eye-opening effect all over the world.

The measures introduced to improve the management of the country's economy are also extremely important to the fuller utilisation of the advantages of the economic potential for strengthening the Soviet Union's defensive power. The economic reform which signifies a new approach to the economic management expresses the necessity of adjusting the management of socialist economy to the level and character of the development of the productive forces. It helps to strengthen economic methods of management, to improve state planning and to heighten the economic independence and initiative of enterprises. All this leads to a further upsurge of the country's economy and thus strengthens the defensive capacity of the state. Similar reforms are being carried out in a number of other socialist countries. This creates conditions for the victory of socialism in the economic competition with capitalism and for a further increase in the military might of the socialist community.

As the world socialist system develops, the advantages of the socialist economic system come ever more clearly to the fore. The economic relations between capitalist countries are based on a cruel competitive struggle and on the striving of states with a developed economy to subjugate and exploit those with less developed productive forces. An entirely different picture is observed in the relations between the countries in the world socialist system. Here, such old forms of economic links between countries as trade and credit have been filled with a new content, they are used to promote the most rapid economic development of all socialist coun-

[1] *Bilanz des zweiten Weltkrieges*, S. 228.

tries and to raise the less developed to the level of the most developed.

Moreover, new forms of economic co-operation and socialist mutual assistance have been devised: the co-ordination of national economic plans, the specialisation and co-operation of production on the basis of the international socialist division of labour, the exchange of scientific and technological achievements, assistance in the training of specialists; and the joint construction of industrial enterprises, power and transport projects.

All these new relations have raised the economic potential of the socialist community and will promote the rapid and efficient utilisation of its material and human resources in case of war.

3. SCIENCE AND THE MILITARY POWER OF STATES

With the revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism social development has come to depend on scientific progress much more than ever before. Science has become a powerful factor in the development of the productive forces, intervenes into the relations of production and actively influences society's material and spiritual culture.

A vivid feature of the modern epoch is the unprecedentedly rapid development of *science*, its increasing influence on all aspects of material and spiritual life.

Socialist social relations create favourable conditions for the all-embracing influence of science on all aspects of the country's life. Marxism-Leninism is the basis for steering the development of socialist society, a powerful instrument for the cognition and revolutionary transformation of the world.

The growing role of science in social life is an objective law of historical development. This law operates also in the military field. Being mediated by definite socio-economic and political conditions and also by the spiritual life of society all sciences promote the development of military affairs.

The Second World War has shown that the victory of one warring side over the other is attained not only on the

battle-fields, not only at the factories and on the wheat fields, but also in the research laboratories, in the studies of scientists. Soviet scientists evolved new types of weapons and military equipment possessing high tactical and technical qualities.

An important contribution to the victory of the Soviet Union over Hitler Germany has been made by the Marxist-Leninist theory. It helped to mould a scientific world outlook in the Soviet people, in the fighting men, to develop in the personnel high political, moral and fighting qualities. Marxism-Leninism played an important role in the achievement of the supremacy of Soviet military thought over bourgeois military theory. The victory over the enemies of the Soviet Union was simultaneously a victory of Marxism-Leninism, of progressive social science over bourgeois views on the historical process.

In the post-war years all sciences served as the theoretical basis for radical changes in military affairs. They enabled the Soviet Union and other socialist countries considerably to raise the level of their defensive capacity.

It is now generally recognised that the military power of the state, the relation of forces of the probable opponents cannot be assessed if their scientific achievements are thrown off the scales.

Character and Ways of the Influence of Science on Military Affairs

The various sciences are connected with the military power of the state (coalition) in various ways. The natural sciences are linked directly with military equipment and weapons, with the control of the equipment and the troops; the social sciences have to do with the organisation of the troops, their training and education, with the development of the political maturity, combat efficiency and morale of the troops, with the raising of their ideological level, with the leadership of the troops in combat and in peacetime. The natural and social sciences also influence military affairs through military theory; military science is linked with all military matters and takes into account the influence exercised by social conditions on its development.

Of all the branches of scientific research that were of special, even decisive, importance in the creation of modern means of warfare the following should be mentioned. First

and most important is physics, the leading branch of the natural sciences, which is most closely linked with industry and military affairs. Physics has provided the theoretical basis for the development of modern power engineering. It has discovered the basic laws of thermodynamics, revealed the laws and properties of sound, light and electricity, looked into the abysmal processes of the microworld. Physics served as the theoretical basis for the creation first of atomic and then of thermonuclear weapons. The transition from the use for military purposes of chemical energy to the use of nuclear energy marked an enormous leap in the military sphere. At present nuclear energy is widely used in the military sphere alongside with mechanical, thermal, electric, chemical and other kinds of energy. Nuclear energy is used in weapons of mass destruction and military equipment.

The foreign press has reported that in recent years major research is being conducted to master fundamentally new physical methods for the direct transformation of thermal into electric energy in static systems which have no moving parts (thermoelectric, thermoelectronic and segnetoelectric). Considerable success has been achieved in producing compact, enduring sources of electric power for radio and other equipment.

In the USA high priority is given to research connected with the creation of quantum generators of light and infrared rays, installations making it possible to create directed concentrated electromagnetic rays of vast power. This principle has been widely used for guiding the flight of artificial satellites and space missiles at enormous distances, in communications, especially in combination with radio devices.

It has been found that Laser radio stations can transmit simultaneously thousands of TV programmes and telephone conversations. A system of Lasers can control the mutual approach of spaceships with an accuracy of up to 30 cm per second, and in case of shorter distances—in the order of 3 cm per second. After the successful walk in space by cosmonauts this has become an important practical task. The USA and other bourgeois countries are attempting to use quantum generators for the creation of so-called ray weapons.

The importance of physics to military affairs is not exhausted by the problem of the provision of power sources. The various special branches of physics—aerodynamics, gas dynamics, rocket dynamics, electricity and magnetism, radiophysics and electronics, molecular electronics and other relatively independent physical sciences—are indissolubly linked with the entire technological basis of military affairs.

Alongside with physics an enormous influence has been exerted on military affairs by mathematics, chemistry and radioelectronics, which are fundamental to the design of rockets of various types. The enormous successes in rocket construction scored by the USSR are largely due to the theoretical works of many scientists, notably of the great scholar K. E. Tsiolkovsky, whose brilliant ideas were summarised and developed by modern scientists.

The building of rockets became possible once heat-resisting materials, that is materials capable of withstanding very high temperatures, had been created, and when chemistry could supply the necessary fuel for their engines. For rockets to be constructed and launched there must also be modern remote control devices and rapid computers.

Electronics, which is closely connected with the physico-mathematical, chemical and mechanical sciences, is also developing apace. It is used not only in radio communications, radar and TV, but also in designing electronic computers, and rocket control systems.

The successful launchings of Soviet ballistic rockets testify to the perfection and high quality of both the rockets and the flight control devices based on electronics. The latter plays the leading role in the modern scientific and technological revolution. There is no field of science, technology, culture or an economic branch that does not use electronics. Its development largely decides the military power of a country.

With the level military equipment has reached today automation on the basis of electronics has become essential to further developments in the military field. This is due to the greater mobility of the troops and the greater difficulty of controlling them, and also to the need to make more effective use of weapons and equipment which are growing ever more powerful and rapid.

Chemistry too, especially the chemistry of high molecular

compounds, has scored remarkable success. The progress of chemistry has made it possible to take up the mass production of materials that are not available in a natural state. Interacting with other sciences, chemistry is now penetrating into all fields of human life. It does much to secure the rapid development of the productive forces.

The role of chemistry in the life of society is growing. Chemistry is also of great importance to military affairs, to military technology.

Chemistry has provided a number of new substances of very high purity. New materials have been produced that are able to withstand very high temperatures and resist corrosion; semi-conductors and new high-quality insulation materials for radio and electric engineering equipment, various special alloys, various plastics and building materials, etc., have come into use.

Materials now being manufactured have predetermined properties which are not possessed by natural materials. These materials (glass plastics, synthetic mica, asbestos, fibres, resins, plastics, etc.) are widely applied in military equipment.

For instance, according to foreign sources, the utilisation of nylon and teflon driving bands makes it possible to accelerate the velocity of shells and to extend the service life of artillery barrels. Plastics artillery cases have replaced metal ones; combustible cases have been produced for tanks and self-propelled guns. New explosives, new signalling, illuminating, incendiary and camouflaging materials, special lubricants and fuel, etc., have been manufactured.

The achievements of modern biology are applied in medicine, in virusology and bacteriology, and also in the production of antibiotics.

The practical possibilities of biology were exploited already during the Second World War. It played a major role in protecting the troops and population from various diseases and epidemics, which greatly decreased the adverse after-effects of wounds; it improved sanitation and did much to make medicine more effective.

The prime task of biology and medicine is to care for man's health, to strengthen his organism, to protect the servicemen and the population from various diseases, especially from mass epidemics.

In the capitalist countries, notably in the USA, research is conducted to find ways of using biological means as weapons of mass destruction. The imperialists pin great hopes on such weapons. General William Creasy, former head of the US Chemical Corps, said that bacteriological warfare, as opposed to the atom bomb and other explosives, does not destroy buildings and machines; it attacks only man and the basis of his subsistence—cattle and fields. He said that special experiments with the most varied kinds of weapons, taking into account the prospects of bacteriological warfare, would be accelerated.

The emergence of a new weapon inevitably leads to the creation of means of defence against it. Biology in conjunction with other sciences, notably with chemistry, is also called upon to tackle this task.

The above achievements of modern science are of major importance in military matters. Naturally, they do not exhaust the scientific subjects and theories that play a major role in military affairs. Bionics, for example, has begun to play a major role in recent years. Bionics is the science studying biological processes and systems, the functional or structural parameters of which can be used to solve concrete tasks. It is applied in radioelectronics, for military transport purposes, in the designing of various simulators, can render invaluable services in solving problems connected with the camouflaging of troops, with preserving secrecy. Bionics can be used also for the improvement of military organisation.

The natural and mathematical sciences have had a major impact on military affairs and are now a necessary element in the control of combat operations.

Referring to the Second World War, John Bernal wrote: "It was not only in the field of production of weapons that the experience of the war was to add to the range of action of the physical sciences. For the first time, in war, the work of the scientist took him from a consideration of the weapons to that of their uses on the field of battle. From the result of these studies it was almost inevitable to go on to the scientific treatment in observation and experiment of actual military operations, on land and sea and in the air."[1]

[1] John D. Bernal, *Science in History*, London, 1954, pp. 580-81.

During the Second World War special teams of scientists in the USA successfully co-operated with the command to investigate the operations of the bomber arm and of the Navy. They conducted research to work out effective anti-submarine warfare, to elaborate principles for the formation of convoys and for escorting them, to establish the most rational distribution of armour on tanks, etc.

The radical changes in the nature of combat operations and of the war as a whole owing to the broad introduction of nuclear weapons, the motorisation and mechanisation of armies, the greater role assigned to airborne troops, the improvement of communications and intelligence, etc., made it necessary to apply scientific control methods on an even larger scale than before.

A successful solution of this task was made possible by science. For example, in order to use missiles effectively, servicemen must possess extensive knowledge, not only of the equipment, but also of the earth's magnetic fields, of the flux of cosmic particles, the laws of the movement of masses of air, etc. A special role is played by mathematics, for example, the theory of probability, the theory of games, linear and dynamic programming, etc.

Cybernetics, the science about the control of complex processes and operations in machines, living organisms and society, is also important to the control of military equipment and the troops. As regards its methods, this is a mathematical science which uses the achievements of electronic computer techniques. It also helps to control processes that are otherwise difficult to control or cannot be controlled by means of old methods because they develop too rapidly or because they depend on a mass of interdependent variables.

The contradiction between the constantly growing speed of combat operations and the inertia of the existing systems of controlling troops and weapons is being transcended with the help of cybernetics and other sciences. Cybernetics makes it possible quickly and effectively to carry out a quantitative analysis of the relation of forces and means of the opposing sides, to provide data necessary to choose the sector on which to attack the enemy, to determine the average rate of advance, to assess the importance of enemy objects, to distribute means for the realisation of specific tasks, to obtain

various information from the troops and to supply them with such, etc. Without cybernetics it would be impossible to make the computations necessary to deliver nuclear missile attacks, to organise air defence systems. Cybernetics makes it possible to automate information processing and accounting, the staff and command planning. With the help of cybernetics it is possible to set up a single automated system which is able to control all links from individual aircraft, tanks, submarines, launching sites and all-arms subunits, to the General Staff.

The further development of military skills, the search for the most effective methods of preparing and conducting the armed struggle, and the solution of problems connected with the use in that struggle of modern weapons and equipment, are possible only if the achievements of mathematics, the natural sciences and technology are utilised. With the contemporary revolution in the military field, the natural sciences have begun to exert an enormous influence on the training of officers and men, on their thinking, combat efficiency and morale. They have become an educative force. In this function the natural sciences are closely linked with the social sciences. The social sciences serving capital cannot harmoniously co-operate with the natural sciences—they contradict each other.

In socialist society the social sciences play a major role in strengthening the defensive capacity of the country, in raising the combat power of the armed forces. Military affairs are becoming ever more closely connected with the social sciences; depend on their development and the effective utilisation of their achievements in the training and education of the troops, in the development and control of the armed forces.

Marxist-Leninist theory has scientifically resolved the problem of war and peace, has given an answer to the vital questions of today, has worked out ways and means for strengthening the defensive power of the Soviet Union in present-day conditions. It helps to work out the military doctrine, to improve the instruction and education of the troops, and so on.

The social sciences have an exclusively important role to play in moulding a scientific world outlook in the Soviet soldiers. The nucleus of this world outlook is Marxism-Lenin-

ism—the Marxist philosophy, economic teaching and scientific communism. An active role is played also by other social sciences, by history, law and psychology.

An important contribution to the formation of a scientific world outlook has been made also by the natural sciences. They provide knowledge about basic elements of the scientific picture of the world, the basic laws of the Universe. *A scientific world outlook is the main instrument with which science affects the ideology, consciousness, psychology of man, of the soldier, through which it affects his entire spiritual world.* Marxism-Leninism helps the soldiers thoroughly to understand the responsibility they bear for the defence of their country, explains to them the nature of their military duties, the specifics of these duties, and the ways and means to educate in the soldiers a correct attitude towards the service. It is essential to raise their combat efficiency and morale, to temper the troops psychologically and to strengthen their combat efficiency and readiness.

It is particularly important that the social sciences help the soldiers synthesise military knowledge with the knowledge gained from the natural sciences, and thus show how to perfect the former. All the sciences are used *to raise military-technical standards, this indicator of the level of the productivity of military service.* It is only when the military-technical standards of the soldiers attain a certain level that it becomes possible for them to master weapons and equipment to perfection, to improve their skills, to master allied specialities, to hit the target with the first shot, to shoot and drive motor vehicles at night no worse than during the day, to outstrip the standards provided for getting military equipment ready for combat, to drive military vehicles at high speeds and to operate them without overhauls longer than is provided by the relevant quotas, etc.

The Scientific Potential and the Conditions Determining Its Development

The qualitatively new, growing role all the sciences play in strengthening the military power of states (coalitions), in the course and outcome of modern wars, is expressed by the concept *scientific potential.*

Both Marx and Lenin noted in their time that a powerful flux streams from social science to natural science and vice versa. Today this process has become particularly intensive

in the socialist countries. The solution of problems advanced by the natural sciences and technology evolves certain social problems, while the development of social life and the expanding knowledge about it pose new questions to the natural sciences and technology. The various trends of scientific research merge into a single process which becomes a revolutionising factor that changes all aspects of the life of society.

In the capitalist countries this is a one-sided process. Only in socialist society have conditions been created in which all sciences can realise their creative possibilities to the utmost.

The realisation of the practical tasks of social development, the solution of the problem of war and peace and the military power of states depend greatly on the level and rate of scientific development. Therefore, the scientific potential of a country embraces *all the natural and social sciences,* including military science, and all their achievements, ensuring the development of the economy, technology, all aspects of social life and, of course, of military power.

By the scientific potential of a country (coalition) is meant the level and development rate of scientific thought, its ability rapidly and effectively to resolve problems vital to the development of society and science itself, vital to creativity.

Scientific potential can be characterised qualitatively and quantitatively. The most important indicators are the development of all sciences, especially the leading social and natural sciences, mathematics and military theory, and also the rate at which they develop; the mobility of the sciences in implementing key tasks of the present and the future; the nature of their links with practice and the rate by which scientific discovery outstrips its practical implementation; the number of scientific workers and their skill, the number of educational and research establishments; the state of the educational system in the country; the ability to plan the development of science and its management by the state and the ruling party.

What decides the scientific potential of a state and the rates at which it grows?

The scientific potential is determined first and foremost by the state of theoretical, so-called fundamental research, which delves into as yet unknown properties of matter, phenomena and natural and social laws, and evolves new methods for their study and application.

Important, fundamentally new scientific discoveries or generalisations are the cornerstone of the whole edifice of science; they secure the advance of science for long periods. Thus, the vital principles of Marxist-Leninist theory served as the basis for the scientific determination of the ultimate aims of the working people's struggle, and also of the concrete tasks which had to be implemented to attain these aims. Fundamental discoveries pave the road for the advance of the technical applied sciences, for the improvement of machinery, production processes, weapons, etc.

The CPSU therefore takes care to promote, first and foremost, the development of Marxist-Leninist theory, and also of mathematics, physics, chemistry and biology. Large-scale theoretical research is conducted in the branches decisive to social progress: a study is made of the whole range of laws governing the growing of socialism into communism, the problem of war and peace; work is underway in the basic fields of technological progress, space research, mineral prospecting, etc.

The relation between theoretical research and the applied sciences is more favourable in the Soviet Union than it is, for example, in the USA and Britain, where until very recently preference was given to applied research. However, of late the USA has been trying to remedy this situation. A great many measures have been taken, notably in the military field, with this end in view. This was confirmed by Robert McNamara, the former US Secretary of Defence, who said: "Our strength tomorrow will be largely the result of the research and development we are conducting today."[1]

Socialist society has pronounced advantages over capitalist society as regards the development and application of the social sciences in the interests of progress.

Successes in physics, chemistry, mathematics, biology, economics, psychology, etc., stimulate the development of military affairs, prevent them from marking time. The securing of supremacy over the opponent is linked with the priority development of fundamental as well as of applied research in the natural and social sciences. In this respect too all sciences must develop harmoniously.

The scientific potential depends on the number of research

[1] The *Saturday Evening Post*, No. 39, November 7, 1964, p. 16.

establishments, scientific and engineering workers, and their training, on the state of the educational system.

In 1913 Russia had several dozen research establishments, mainly in the capital, and just over 10,000 researchers. Today the USSR has over 4,600 research establishments and over 820,000 researchers (25 per cent of the world total), who are working in all the fields of modern science and technology. The Soviet Union is training three times as many engineers as the USA. The funds allotted by the state to the development of science grow all the time.

The annual enrolment in higher educational establishments is four times higher in the Soviet Union than that in Britain, France, West Germany and Italy taken together.

Such successes in the training of specialists are indissolubly linked with the development of education, with the general cultural upsurge in the country. Such a far-flung network of free public education from the primary school to the universities is possible only in socialist conditions. It serves as a good basis for technological progress and the flourishing of science, of the achievements of which the Soviet people are justly proud. In the Soviet Union 483 of every 1,000 inhabitants have a higher or a secondary (complete or incomplete) education. The President of Michigan University knew what he was talking about when he said that if the USA were defeated in the educational field, it would undoubtedly suffer defeat in all other fields of human knowledge.

The decisive condition for raising the scientific potential is the level of the productive forces and the character of the economic and political relations ruling at the given time in society.

Although the natural and technical sciences develop relatively independently, their progress is ultimately determined by the needs of social production. In our time the dependence of the scientific potential on the productive forces, notably on heavy industry, engineering and instrument-making, is particularly great.

Only the high development of modern industry makes it possible to create the material basis needed for theoretical research and experimental work, namely, perfect laboratory equipment and the installations required to study phenomena of the material world. Large-scale industry makes it possible to introduce scientific discoveries into practice, and owing to

the advantages of socialist economy this happens much quicker in the socialist than in the capitalist countries. This is of prime importance to scientific development.

As distinct from the capitalist countries all conditions have been created in Soviet society to direct the work of scientists all over the country according to a single plan providing for the solution of key theoretical and practical problems having enormous significance to the building of communism and to strengthening the state's defensive capacity.

The activities of scientists, as also that of Soviet society as a whole, are being guided by the Communist Party. In the USSR science has become a state matter, an object of the constant care of the Party and the people.

The reason for the indubitable advantages of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries over the capitalist countries in the organisation of research work is that the scientists rely on a genuinely scientific world outlook and methodological basis—dialectical materialism, and have nobler stimuli for the development of science. Being part of the people, indissolubly linked with them, scientists work for the people's benefit and thereby fulfil their patriotic duty to the country. This is an enormous source of creative inspiration.

Another advantage of the scientific potential under the socialist system is that here science has become a productive force, that scientists constantly co-operate with the workers and collective farmers, with the people producing the material wealth.

As the country moves towards communism, the working people participate ever more extensively in scientific development, and the alliance between science and labour is growing stronger. It finds expression in the development of public initiative in science and technology. Fruitful work is done on voluntary principles by various organisations. Many production and technological councils, "universities" for technical propaganda, creative co-operation and other teams have been set up at factories and building sites, in transport, at state farms and research and design institutes. Hundreds of thousands of research workers, engineers, designers, technicians, statisticians, accountants and advanced workers participate in them. The number of production rationalisers and inventors grows steadily, as does also the number of their proposals introduced in production.

Thus, the socialist system has obvious advantages in the organisation of research and design work. Its scientific potential grows quicker than that of the capitalist countries, including that of such a rich and technically developed country as the USA.

It would, however, be dangerous to underestimate the capitalist countries' possibilities for scientific and technological development. The scientific potential of the USA, the Federal Republic of Germany and some other capitalist countries is very high indeed. These states take the maximum efforts and allot enormous funds to develop all branches of science in the interest of their war machines. Therefore, for the socialist countries to hold their lead in the scientific potential, the scientists, engineers, designers and workers in those countries must continue to work creatively under the guidance by the Communist Party. This guarantees the further development of the social, natural and technical sciences and the quickest introduction of their achievements into practice.

4. MORAL-POLITICAL BASIS OF THE STATE'S MILITARY POWER

In all the biggest wars of the past, especially the world wars, not only the morale of the army, but also that of the entire population of the warring states (coalitions) constituted a factor of enormous strategic importance. This will apply even more in a world nuclear war, should the imperialists unleash it.

The thinkers and military leaders of the past noticed the dependence of victories or defeats in wars and battles on the state of the morale of the people and the warring armies. The works of the military theoreticians of the past—Clausewitz, Foch, Bernhardi, Jomini, Mikhnevich, Leer and Dragomirov—contain many correct, original thoughts about the place and role of the morale of soldiers in combat. At the beginning of the 20th century in Russia the libraries in officers' clubs contained many works on that subject. However, the idealist, often purely religious understanding of spiritual make-up as a thing inborn and unknowable, made it impossible for the authors of these works to look deep into the problem. These writings describe the rich historical expe-

rience of many wars, but they do it on the basis of idealist, positivist methodology.

The enormous and ever-increasing role of morale in modern wars is now recognised by all. There are however two diametrically opposed viewpoints on its essence and sources—the idealist, anti-scientific, and the dialectico-materialist, scientific.

Imperialist ideologists and military theoreticians look for the source of the morale of the people and the army in God, or in man's anthropological and psychological traits, i.e., they explain ideas by other ideas, derive views from other views. First of all this approach distorts the essence of the moral potential, belittles the decisive importance of the political content of the people's spiritual forces; secondly, it ignores what is most important—the socio-political sources and economic basis of these forces. This falls in with their class interests and their theoretical and methodological basis, which was treated in detail in the first chapter, in the section about the essence and sources of wars.

Moral Potential and Moral Factor

From the viewpoint of the dialectico-materialist understanding of history the moral potential is the aggregate of moral, political and spiritual powers of a people. It expresses the ability and willingness of the population of a certain state (class or social group) to take joint action for the achievement of aims of great socio-historic importance.

In military respects the moral potential means a definite degree of readiness by the people and the army to endure the extremely heavy trials of modern war, and not to lose the will to fight and defeat the enemy. Essentially, this is a moral and political potential.

The moral potential includes the morale of the people and the army. Once set in motion, the moral potential becomes a moral factor. The moral factor, as applied to society as a whole, is the resolve of the masses to carry out major social, economic, political and military tasks. The moral factor, as applied to the army, can be defined as the spiritual ability and willingness of the army to endure the heaviest trials of war without losing the will to struggle and defeat the enemy.

The moral potential and the moral factor are not constant magnitudes. They undergo small and big changes, sometimes

slow and gradual, sometimes quick and sudden. This is particularly typical of the modern epoch. The efficiency with which the moral potential is utilised depends on the activity of state and military institutions, on the work of the Party and other political organisations, and is ultimately determined by the nature of the social system, by the ideology ruling in society, and also by the aims for the sake of which the war is waged.

The most important source of the people's and the army's morale is the socio-political system of the state. In its function as the source of the military might of a state, the socio-political system is nowadays considered not within the framework of individual countries, but within the framework of coalitions of states, with opposite social systems.

The relations of comradeship and co-operation inherent in socialism and the policy pursued by the socialist states express the vital interests of the popular masses and are given every support by them. The Marxist-Leninist ideology, dominant in the socialist countries, is an inexhaustible source for mass creativity, a powerful accelerator of social progress. The collective wisdom and will, the unity of the ideological and organisational work of the Communist and Workers' Parties, secure the transformation of the enormous moral and political possibilities into reality and are, therefore, an important source for the firmness of the people's spiritual forces. All this creates a stable political basis for the armed forces, for strengthening the defensive capacity of the country.

In recent years there has been a further consolidation of these sources owing to the extension of the socialist state's social basis, the further strengthening of the unity of the Soviet people and the peoples of other countries in the socialist community.

Conversely, in the capitalist countries the socio-political basis of the people's and the army's morale is eroding. This is due to the growth of militarism, to the encroachments on bourgeois democracy (which is extremely narrow at the best of times), to the striving to set up dictatorial regimes and also to unrestrained demagogical propaganda. Socio-political antagonisms are aggravating in the bourgeois states, and are lowering the moral potentials of those states. This applies also to the imperialist coalition as a whole.

When making an assessment of the moral potential of the imperialist states it is essential to adopt a concrete historical approach. It is one thing when a revolutionary situation prevails in those countries and when they embark on a period of social upheavals, and quite another, when the bourgeoisie in those countries has smashed the democratic forces by direct terror and large masses of the population are brainwashed by demagogic propaganda. Under such conditions the bourgeoisie is able to "pep up" the moral potential of the whole country and to lead the working masses into unjust, predatory wars.

This happened in nazi Germany in 1939 when she unleashed the Second World War and also in 1941 when she treacherously attacked the Soviet Union. This war, it will be remembered, was supported by a large part of the German population. In addition to demagogy the lightning victories of the nazi army in Western Europe and, in the early stages of the war, also in the Soviet Union, were a major contributing factor. The heavy blows the Soviet Army delivered to the German fascist troops, however, affected the morale of the German population and the fighting efficiency of the German army. The collapse of the Blitzkrieg plan and the counter-offensive mounted by the Soviet Army at Moscow made the Germans realise for the first time that defeat was possible. After the disaster on the Volga the German population and troops began to lose their faith in victory. "The disaster at Stalingrad profoundly shocked the German people and armed forces alike...."[1] Although the nazi troops fought stubbornly right up to the end of the war, being driven to it by brutal discipline and desperation, and also by the fear of retribution for the monstrous crimes they had committed, their offensive spirit was considerably weakened.

The morale of the population and the army of the bourgeois states reflects the antagonistic contradictions reigning in them and vacillates greatly depending on victory or defeat. Only powerful blows against the aggressor and his troops are able to erode and then to destroy their fighting spirit. Therefore, in preparing to rebuff possible imperialist aggression, the Soviet state and its Armed Forces are firmly resolved to rout the aggressor by the strength of their weapons and their morale.

The fundamental difference between the basis on which the morale of the people and army in the socialist countries

[1] *The Fatal Decisions*, New York, 1956, p. 190.

is founded and that underlying the people's and army's morale in the bourgeois countries has left its mark also on the spiritual make-up of the people. The great economic and political transformations following the October Revolution in Russia have wrought deep changes in social consciousness, have established an ideological unity in Soviet society. Several generations in the country were educated in the spirit of selfless devotion to the ideals of communism. Soviet man has become a fighter, a revolutionary, a conscious worker. In the Soviet Union and other socialist countries New Man is shaping, new "human material" is being created.

A new, vivid feature in the make-up of Soviet man is his thirst for knowledge; it has become a typical trait of the majority of Soviet people. The striving after an all-round harmonious development of the personality offers broad prospects for self-education. There is a marked expansion in the range of his interests and intellectual needs. Man grows spiritually mature much earlier. He is deeply aware of communist ideals, of his personal responsibility for the fate of his country.

Different socio-political systems educate different people. This must be taken into account when the moral factor in different states and their coalitions is estimated.

Besides, an evaluation of the moral factors of the probable opponents or belligerents must take into account that the socio-political system finds its practical expression in the state policy, and hence in the aims each state pursues in preparing for war or in waging it.

The political war aim has a decisive influence on the morale of the people and the army during the war.

People make history consciously, but their role in historical events depends on how correctly they realise the true causes of events, and their driving forces, how correctly they evaluate what class interests are promoted by a definite outcome of events. In this connection Lenin said: "An eighteenth-century Prussian monarch once wisely remarked: 'If our soldiers knew what we were fighting for, it would be impossible to wage a single war.' "[1]

When the masses are aware that the war pursues unjust political aims, the moral possibilities of the country waging

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 66.

such a war are sharply curtailed. If the level of the working people's class consciousness is low, if the working people are unorganised, the imperialist states have greater moral possibilities to prepare and wage wars the aims of which are contrary to the working people's interests. Hence, in assessing the moral possibilities of the imperialist states in wartime, not only the economic and socio-political system of these countries but also the war's political content must be taken into account.

Just, progressive wars redouble the spiritual forces of the people and the army, raise their morale. That is why the Communist Party, in rousing the people to the defence of the socialist country, broadly explains the aims and causes of the war. Lenin said: "The realisation by the masses of the causes and aims of the war is of tremendous importance and ensures victory."[1] This has been proved correct in the Soviet Union during the Civil War and again during the Great Patriotic War. We see this also from the example of Indochina, where the giant US war machine is unable to break the power and will of the peoples defending the independence of their countries.

The above shows that the *economic and socio-political system of socialism contains the objective conditions for an all-out consolidation and development of the moral possibilities of the socialist states.* Naturally, the moral strength of the people in the socialist countries does not develop by itself, and the advantages of the socialist system do not assert themselves automatically. They are achieved by the ideological work of the Communist and Workers' Parties, by the irreconcilable struggle against bourgeois ideology and its remnants in the consciousness of the people. That struggle strengthens the moral potential, develops and helps effectively to use the spiritual energy of the people, their invincible will for victory over all aggressors.

Content and Structure of the Moral Factor

A knowledge of the basis, of the sources of the people's and the army's moral strength is important to victory. It makes it possible effectively to form, maintain and strengthen the morale in different conditions. But, to be able to do this more purposefully, it is

[1] *Ibid.*, Vol. 31, p. 137.

essential, among other things, to know the structure of the moral factor, of its key elements. Sociologists and military theoreticians of the past repeatedly attempted to define the essence and structure of the moral factor. But the idealistic, sometimes frankly anthropological, interpretation of morale stopped them from solving the problem. Neither has it been resolved by modern bourgeois military thought.

What is the structure of the moral factor of the socialist state?

The moral factor is a dialectical unity of the objective and the subjective. The objective and subjective aspects of the moral factor are determined by the nature of the social system, the existing social relations, the requirements for progressive development. The moral factor is objective in the sense that it is expressed in the real actions, the behaviour, the deeds of the Soviet people, soldiers and sailors.[1] The subjective aspect of the moral factor is expressed by the fact that man's willingness to suffer the heavy trials of modern war and not to lose the will to struggle and win is mediated by his consciousness. "The influences of the external world upon man," Engels noted, "express themselves in his brain, are reflected therein as feelings, thoughts, impulses, volitions —in short, as 'ideal tendencies', and in this form become 'ideal powers'."[2]

The structure of the moral factor can be conditionally pictured as two big groups of elements, which are closely interlinked and interwoven.

The first group is made up of socio-ideological elements, which express the conscious class interests, aims and tasks resolved by the war. The socio-ideological elements of the moral factor form a system of views and theories as regards the war, its aims and consequences. They include, first and foremost, the ideas and views on the essence of wars, their content and character, and also conceptions about the motherland and its armed defence, the role of the popular

---

[1] A moral action is objective primarily because it is carried out under the influence of objective conditions and is an objective reality to other people. But the internal essence of a moral action is always ideal, and moral relations are therefore usually part of the sphere of ideological relations.

[2] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, in three volumes, Vol. III, Moscow, 1970, p. 352.

masses in the war and other important ideological conceptions. The elements of this group are predominantly rationalistic.

The socio-ideological elements are characterised by great harmony and logical perfection. They do not arise spontaneously, but form owing to the purposeful activity of the commanders, political workers and Party organisations. These elements reflect the entire system of the prevailing social relations. They are scientific, permeated by a spirit of historical optimism, instil deep conviction in the triumph of the ideas of communism and in the victory over any aggressor.

These elements are expressed in different forms of social consciousness, among which a special place is held by political and moral forms. The willingness and ability of the Soviet people and soldiers to fulfil their patriotic, military duty is called "moral factor" because the attitude of people to the war is expressed first and foremost by moral categories: good and evil, justice and injustice, etc. Such categories of military ethics as "military duty", "moral responsibility", "military honour and dignity", "bravery", "heroism", "self-sacrifice" and others, characterise the most important aspects and features expressing the moral strength of the Soviet soldiers.

The second group of elements making up the moral factor are the socio-psychological ones. As distinct from those of the first group, they shape largely under the direct influence of the environment. They embrace the complex aggregate of the notions, impressions and sentiments which are aroused in the population and the soldiers in the course of their everyday life. Among those that deserve particular mention are the military traditions and customs, patriotic feelings, revolutionary sentiments, practical experience and habits connected with the defence of the country, and also some of the illusions and erroneous ideas about war. People express their attitude to the war, to its aims and character, by means of socio-psychological traits, but if that attitude does not include ideological elements, it can be neither lofty nor firm. The elements of the second group have a comparatively stable character. Most mobile among them are emotions and sentiments; less mobile, traditions, habits and customs. The least changeable is social and psychological make-up, the "moral

qualities" of nations, of a people, which Marx and Engels called the "conscience of a nation", the "shame of a people", etc. Some of the socio-psychological elements are conservative, others react to environmental influences immediately. Hence, if negative psychological elements predominate in a person's consciousness, he may, in a critical moment, submit to the direct influence of negative feelings—to fear, to terror, and his actions will be dictated by such feelings.

In army conditions the socio-psychological elements have a clearly pronounced collectivist nature. In a military body collective sentiments, such as public opinion, collective will, collective anger, etc., find a particularly quick expression. Inspiration, suggestion, etc., exert an active influence. In political respects socio-psychological elements sometimes predominate in the moral factor, but as regards their significance and trend the decisive role belongs to the socio-ideological elements. They make up the main content and main trend of the moral factor.

Naturally, the division of the elements of the moral factor into two groups is mobile and relative. They influence each other, interpenetrate and overlap. Ideological elements are present in the socio-psychological ones (political sentiments: love for one's country and hatred for the enemy, etc.) and vice versa—socio-psychological elements "colour" the ideological components: the emotional expression of ideas, views, the preservation of habitual methods of reasoning. A decisive influence on the strength of the morale is exerted by ideological-political views. Ideals of the defence of the motherland, of communism, once implanted in people's consciousness interact with traditions, habits, with the whole range of moral qualities, feelings, and sentiments. Political ideas permeate, as it were, the moral and psychological elements and thus themselves acquire an emotional shade. They simultaneously influence all aspects of people's psychology in a definite direction, and concentrate the will, thoughts and feelings on the fulfilment of a concrete task, mobilise the people's entire spiritual energy for decisive actions, for selfless deeds.

The absence or weakness of some positive element of the moral factor inevitably tells on the level of the people's and army's morale. Strong ideological convictions, which form the main element in the strength of the morale, presuppose

the necessary moral-psychological qualities. A strong will that is not propped by high ideals can become dangerous not only for the enemy, since a will without the proper ideas to back it is blind and fanatical. People possess a strong character and a high morale only if their passionate ideological conviction is combined with steadfastness, decisiveness, a firm will and other moral-psychological properties.

Being relatively independent, the moral factor absorbs the revolutionary and military traditions of the past, and patriotism. In this sense the firmness of the soldiers' morale depends on the people's spiritual wealth in the past. The present Soviet generation preserves the progressive traditions born of past wars as a precious heritage. The rich moral experience of the revolutionary battles, of the victories in the Great Patriotic War are a valuable possession of the Soviet people.

Views and customs that are outmoded and no longer apply to present-day conditions must be overcome.

If one does not feel the rapid rhythm of life, does not opportunely understand the new demands put on the people's spiritual forces by our dynamic epoch, the relative independence of the moral factor may become responsible for a lag in the development of some of its elements. This is a serious danger. "The tradition of all the dead generations weighs like a nightmare on the brain of the living. And just when they seem engaged in revolutionising themselves and things, in creating something that has never yet existed, precisely in such periods of revolutionary crisis they anxiously conjure up the spirits of the past to their service and borrow from them names, battle cries and costumes in order to present the new scene of world history in this time-honoured disguise and this borrowed language."[1]

At the same time the ideological elements of the moral factor tend to outstrip reality in the theoretical aspect. They foreshadow, as it were, the main aspects of the possible war, the role of morale in it.

Thus, the moral factor is a specific manifestation of the social consciousness when such of its forms as political views and morals are pushed to the foreground and play the deci-

---

[1] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, in one volume, Moscow, 1968, p. 97.

sive role in the people's spiritual ability staunchly to endure the heaviest trials of a modern war. It should be remembered here that the formation of a high morale with the population and the army involves the necessity of a purposeful influence on the soldiers' consciousness. This is possible only through reliance on the achievements of modern science.

Increasing Role of the People's Moral Forces in Modern Wars

The enormous role of the moral factor in world wars of the past is explained by the fact that the people had to endure heavy trials. They shouldered the burden of intensive, exhaustive, sometimes excessive, labour in order to satisfy the needs of the front. They suffered heavy privations too. Many hundreds of thousands had to evacuate from frontal zones, to abandon their property and houses. The people remaining on territories occupied by the enemy suffered even worse. For the first time in the history of war regions in the deep rear were bombed by the enemy air force. The death of millions of soldiers at the front brought mental suffering to their relatives and friends.

However, all these privations, sufferings and woes are insignificant as compared with those a world nuclear war would cause.

In the event of war the moral forces of the population which will have to bear unprecedented hardships will acquire crucial importance. Under these conditions the whole system of state measures composing the civil defence, will to a decisive degree depend on the moral strength, endurance and courage of millions of civilians. They will face the extraordinarily complex tasks of ensuring the vital activity in the rear, the operation of major power centres, of the system of economic management, in conditions when mass destruction weapons are applied against them on a vast scale. A whole series of measures which will become essential as soon as the war begins (current information, evacuation, salvage operations and urgent rehabilitation, the fight against subversion, mass medical assistance to the population, supplies) can be carried out only if the Soviet people everywhere, in every populated centre, show the staunchest determination and willingness to make sacrifices. The organisation and the self-discipline of every person, based on strong ideological conviction, on the striving to fulfil one's duty at any cost will assume critical importance in such conditions.

It should be borne in mind that in a war of coalitions, even if it is waged without nuclear weapons, the role of the people's morale will be heightened because the combatants will pursue decisive aims and because the means of the armed struggle will be even more powerful than in the past.

The morale of the servicemen acquires special importance in modern war. This question will be examined in detail in the next chapter.

In the event of war it will be extremely difficult for the military-political leaders of the imperialist countries to maintain the morale of the population at a high level, because there are no social unity and no ideas able to inspire the masses in those countries, to give them the moral fibre to stand the heavy trials of modern war.

The US authors Erich Fromm and Michael Maccoby drew the conclusion that the Western countries would be unable to endure the horrors of the atomic chaos. They said that it was difficult to foresee all the consequences of atomic strikes. There would be mass neurosis which "can result in severe depression, suicidal tendencies, self-accusations, amnesia and disorientation.... The survivors would witness a sudden tearing apart of the whole fabric of society.... In thermonuclear war no part of the social fabric would remain stable. Half of the population killed; most of the leaders gone ... unburied corpses; epidemics.... What sense would life make?... For the majority of people the problem would not only be grief, but the destruction of a way of life....

"If these would be the psychological effects of thermonuclear war, what shall we say about the *moral* consequences of such a war?"[1] the authors ask.

Preparing a nuclear war against the socialist countries, the reactionary political and military leaders of the imperialist countries encounter, as they themselves admit, enormous difficulties in their attempts to strengthen the political structure of the existing system, which is being eroded by social contradictions and conflicts. Political apathy and a feeling of doom, as well as a low level of patriotism, are typical of many layers of the population in capitalist countries.

The peoples of all countries hate war and intensify the struggle against the threat of the imperialists using mass

[1] *Breakthrough to Peace*, New York, 1962, pp. 69, 70, 71.

destruction weapons. The awareness of this threat undermines the moral potential of the aggressors.

Thus, the policies of the imperialist states create conditions eroding their moral possibilities already in peacetime.

The imperialist bloc is confronted by the community of socialist countries which is marching from strength to strength. The growth of its moral possibilities is conditioned by objective development laws. One of them is the increasing consolidation of the ideological and moral-political unity of the peoples within the individual socialist countries and also within the framework of the community of socialist states. At the same time moral motives in the activity of the citizens of those countries are acquiring ever greater importance.

The moral progress of socialist society is of permanent military-political importance, it helps further to raise the military power of the Soviet Army and of the armies of the other Warsaw Treaty countries. The moral superiority, conditioned by the whole socialist way of life, will provide concrete advantages in the course of the armed struggle, namely:

it will enable the leadership of the countries and their armed forces to set the people and army the most difficult tasks with the certainty that they will be fulfilled;

owing to the spiritual superiority the population and armed forces will be less vulnerable to the influence exerted by "psychological warfare" and ideological subversion both in peacetime and during the war;

due to the moral superiority the population of the socialist countries and their armed forces will be able to bear the moral-psychological burden of the war longer than the population and armies of the imperialist countries without "tiring".

* * *

Such are the foundations of the military power of states (coalitions) and at the same time its most important components. In their aggregate they make up the material and spiritual possibilities of states (coalitions), that is, determine the military potential.

Chapter Seven

MILITARY POTENTIAL

The economic, scientific and moral-political potentials influence the course of the war and military operations differently. The influence they exert is determined by the nature of these potentials, by the character of their relation with the various aspects of the war and, notably, with the armed struggle. The military potential plays a special role in this relation. *Being derivative from the economic conditions and the scientific and moral-political potentials, the military potential in its turn determines the military power of the state (coalition), is its most important aspect. It expresses the maximum ability of the state to maintain and improve its armed forces, to raise their combat power, to man them with trained personnel and supply them with modern military equipment and all sorts of materials, especially in wartime.*

A specific feature of the military potential is that it is a direct, leading element of the military power. The radical changes in social development influence the military potential both through the economic, scientific and moral-political potentials, and directly. As its content changes the military potential acquires a new form and role.

Another specific feature of the military potential is that it is embodied directly in the armed forces, in their combat power. Combat power is the measure of the ability possessed by the armed forces to strike blows at the enemy and to rebuff his blows, is the degree of the armed forces' combat readiness. In modern conditions the combat efficiency and combat readiness of the armed forces have become particularly im-

portant because with the beginning of war the combat operations of the troops, especially of the strategic rocket troops, will have to play a decisive role and their result will determine the subsequent course of the war. Contrary to the views held by some bourgeois military experts, this does not mean that the role of mobilisation and the deployment of troops during the war will be reduced to naught. *The military potential therefore includes the combat power of the existing armed forces and also the military-mobilisational possibilities of the state (coalition).*

Combat power is an organic unity of a number of factors, elements or aspects of the armed forces' life and activity. All of them can fulfil their role only if they are connected with each other, and they are all derivative of the economic, scientific, socio-political and ideological conditions.

At the same time elements of the armed forces' combat power possess a certain independence. These elements are both material and spiritual ones, including the technical equipment (military equipment and weapons), the fire power and mobility of the troops, their number, their organisation and training, the commanding cadres, military science and the army's morale.

Among the conditions affecting the military power as a whole and the military potential in particular, the combat power of the armed forces and its elements, a special role is played by the modern revolution in the military field. It lends a qualitatively new content to the military potential, to the elements of the troops' combat power, to military science and the art of war.

1. THE MODERN REVOLUTION IN MILITARY AFFAIRS AND ITS INFLUENCE ON THE MILITARY POTENTIAL

Causes and Essence of the Revolution in Military Affairs

Military affairs develop very unevenly. There were periods when military equipment, weapons, the methods and forms of combat and the war as a whole changed comparatively slowly. These periods were very long, they lasted decades and even centuries. For example, the period of the comparatively slow and gradual devel-

opment of military affairs on the basis of side-arms began with the emergence of wars and continued up to the 15th century. Side-arms were also used in the wars of our century. The period of the gradual development of military affairs on the basis of firearms also lasted for centuries.

But military affairs also went through periods of rapid development, periods of qualitative, radical change. They experienced a series of major revolutions. One of them was ushered in by the invention of powder and the introduction of firearms. This revolution lasted for a comparatively long time. It included a number of stages connected with qualitative changes of firearms and military equipment.

The modern revolution in military affairs began after the Second World War. Essentially it was carried out within a few years, but it still continues to develop. *The revolution in military affairs has been prepared by the whole course of modern social development. Its basis is the powerful advance of the productive forces in the economically highly developed states and scientific and technological progress, and the policies of states are its driving force.*

It is the state policy that directs the economy and scientific and technological progress along a definite course. Politics, expressing the vital, notably the economic, interests of classes, can use economic and scientific development to increase the welfare of the people, to multiply the wealth of society, but it can also use it to harm mankind.

The policies of the imperialist states spark off an upheaval in military affairs because the capitalists are willing to use any means, including war, to shore up the crumbling structure of capitalism. The imperialists are willing to lay all the achievements of the economy, science and technology on the altar of the Moloch of war. They believe that they can save their system by using the achievements of scientific and technological progress for the purpose of war.

Conversely, the policies of the socialist countries have wrought major changes in military affairs to defend peace, democracy and socialism. They have created a reliable nuclear shield against imperialist aggression. The Soviet Union's defences are strengthened in every way in the interest of the Soviet people and of all peace-loving peoples, of all of mankind.

The deepest and general causes, or sources, of the contemporary revolution in military affairs lie in the economy, scientific and technological progress and politics. This revolution is expressed in the radical changes in the key elements of the armed forces' combat power—military equipment, the cultural and technical level of the soldiers, the means and forms of the armed struggle. The last named, and all other aspects of military affairs, are always determined by the quantity and quality of the equipment and by the people handling it.

Naturally, the most mobile and quickly changing element is weapons. Changes in weapons work changes in the various methods of warfare. Advances in weaponry, Engels wrote, "most forcibly produced changes and even revolutions in the methods of warfare, often indeed against the will of the army command".[1] We had an example of this in the changes in the art of war connected with the mass replacement of smooth-bore guns by rifles, with the introduction of machine-guns and other automatic weapons, the application of tanks, aircraft, etc.

Military affairs changed also in connection with the evolution of the socio-political conditions. The most substantial changes took place under the influence of the French bourgeois revolution at the end of the 18th century, and in the 20th century, following the Great October Socialist Revolution. Thus, during the Civil War in Russia, the Red Army, having approximately the same technical equipment as the enemy, waged manoeuvrable, decisive and energetic combat operations. The combat operations waged in the national liberation wars by the peoples of China, Korea, Vietnam, Cuba and other countries also introduced many new methods of warfare.

The modern revolution in military affairs in the USA and the USSR, the countries most advanced and strongest in military respects, is directly linked with radical changes in weapons and military equipment. It follows from the internal logic of the development of military equipment. Of course, one must not ignore the spiritual growth of the Soviet people connected with the USSR's embarkation on the new stage of development, although the decisive element is the revolution

[1] F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, 1969, p. 205.

in military equipment brought about by rapid scientific and technological progress.

This is explained by the fact that combat actions are waged by people who use not only their physical and spiritual forces but also the technical means of armed struggle created by them. The latter inflict upon the opponent direct losses in manpower and materials, create tactical and operational, and also strategic possibilities for routing the enemy.

The more perfect the military equipment, notably the weapons, the greater is the damage they inflict on the enemy, the shorter is the way to victory.

The improvement of military equipment and weapons throughout history may be described as the passing on to them of the key functions people have to perform in the armed struggle—they are made to serve as a power source, engine (transformation of energy), exert direct action on the opponent, carry out control functions, etc. Therefore, *military equipment and weapons include: means of destruction, means of delivery and means of control.* Changes in military equipment proceed unevenly and irregularly.

The creation of means of destruction and means of delivery depends on our knowledge of nature, on our scientific knowledge and on production development. The deeper we cognise nature, the more perfect are weapons; the higher is the level of production and the greater its possibility, the more abundant and widely distributed are weapons. This can be clearly seen from the development of weapons.

Side-arms—the sword, spear, bow, etc.—were predominantly introduced empirically, without scientific knowledge. These weapons increased man's physical strength, enabled him to act over greater distances. Firearms, which use mechanical, physical and chemical energy, considerably increased the possibility of inflicting damage to the opponent.

The knowledge of the fundamental laws of nature made it possible to use enormous nuclear sources of energy in warfare and thereby vastly to increase the pressure on the enemy. Suffice it to say that the explosion of a 10 megaton hydrogen bomb releases an amount of energy exceeding that released by all the explosive materials produced during the Second World War throughout the world.

The use of the powerful forces of nature (the chemical energy of explosions, electric power, nuclear energy), the

utilisation of internal combustion engines, various machinery, radio, automatic and many other technical means have considerably lightened man's efforts, have changed the relation between man and technology in the armed struggle. Man is now able to apply the enormous forces of nature in war. Powerful and perfect military equipment, weapons of enormous destructive power make it easier for the troops to wage combat, increase the effectiveness of their attempts to win victory.

Developments in the military field are characterised by constant quantitative and qualitative changes of the material and technical basis. First to change are the means of destruction. The destructive power of weapons has grown mainly owing to an increase in the power of the charge. When man learned to release the energy locked in the nucleus, the troops were armed with nuclear weapons, which cannot be compared with so-called conventional weapons. The destructive power of weapons has also increased owing to their greater rate of fire and longer range. The range of weapons has increased from several metres to practically unlimited distances (missiles). The enormous power of the nuclear charge as a means of destruction, combined with the missile as a means of delivery, has created a fundamentally new weapons system. All this has wrought vast changes in military affairs, and brought about a veritable revolution in that field. The means of controlling weapons and troops also changed continuously, though generally slower than the means of destruction and means of delivery.

Nuclear missile weapons are able to destroy any enemy objective and to strike any point on the globe almost instantaneously. The enemy can be destroyed not only by series of blows delivered by the troops, but, first and foremost, by direct nuclear missile strikes. The political and military leaders now command over powerful means to strike directly at the enemy and of effectively attaining their aims. This is the characteristic feature of the revolution in military affairs as a whole, which has ushered in a fundamentally new method of resolving the main tasks pursued by combat actions of different scale, and by the war as a whole.

That is why *this sharp, leap-like transition from conventional to nuclear-missile weapons as the main means of waging war and the corresponding new means of achieving the*

basic aims of the war, comprise the essence of the contemporary revolution in military science. Soviet military doctrine assigns a major role in the rout of the aggressor to nuclear weapons. At the same time it does not deny the importance of other kinds of weapons and means of struggle and the possibility, in certain conditions, of combat actions being fought without the use of nuclear weapons. The final victory over the aggressor can be achieved only by the concerted efforts of all the services and arms.

Main Features of the Modern Revolution in Military Affairs

As regards its content and specifics the revolution in military affairs is an extremely complicated and many-faceted phenomenon brought about by the development of the productive forces, by the scientific and technological revolution. It reflects the transformation of science into a direct productive force.

Scientific and technological progress and the logic of the development of military equipment were responsible for the comparatively rapid creation of nuclear weapons, and for the transformation of all of military affairs on their basis. Only a few years were needed before the discovery of the chain reaction released by the fission of the nuclei of uranium materialised in nuclear weapons, power plants and in other specific technological fields. At the same time this led to the growing differentiation of military equipment, its greater complexity and the very rapid rate at which it grows obsolete.

Suffice it to say that every service now commands over hundreds of different types of equipment and weapons systems, while during the Second World War they had only two or three weapons systems at their disposal. The enormous number of parts comprising the various kinds of equipment have made such equipment very complicated and expensive, and it is steadily growing even more complex and more expensive.

According to the US press the complete replacement of the armament of troops, which was necessary to maintain their combat readiness, was formerly carried out on an average once in 14 years. Later this period was cut to ten years, while some equipment—aircraft and missiles, for example—grows obsolete in much less than ten years.

The changes in the military field have not only become

more rapid, but have also become more extensive. They embrace not only one of the services or arms of the services, but all of them, without exception. The introduction of a fundamentally new means of destruction—nuclear weapons—has changed the means of delivery: supersonic aircraft of an enormous payload and rockets of different power and range were built. Revolutionary changes are also being wrought in the means of controlling troops. At the same time the power-to-man ratio has increased greatly. As compared with the beginning of the Second World War it has grown several times over. The armed forces are now motorised. They have at their disposal a large amount of mechanical and automatic equipment, more reliable guns with a much higher rate of fire, new engineering equipment, communication and control devices, etc.

Nuclear weapons have wrought fundamental changes in the structure of the armed forces. For example, in the Soviet Union a new fighting service has been set up—the Strategic Rocket Troops—which is constantly maintained in combat readiness. Nuclear weapons have transformed the Air Defence, Air Force and the Navy. All the arms of the services have changed qualitatively. Nuclear weapons have altered conventional weapons too. They have affected transport facilities, engineer, communication and control equipment. Changes are also being made in the system of the training and education of the servicemen, military theory is developing, etc.

In accordance with the radical changes in the basic elements of military equipment and weapons a number of relatively independent stages can be discerned in the revolution in military affairs. The first stage was linked with the creation of atomic weapons, which ushered in a number of important changes in the military field; the second was connected with the emergence of a carrier for the atomic charge (rockets) and the creation of nuclear missile weapons. Nuclear charges, possessing a fantastic power, were evolved almost simultaneously. In the second stage of the revolution far-reaching changes were made not only in the material and technical basis of military affairs, but also in all other military theory, the organisation of the troops and their structure, in the training and education of servicemen, etc.

These stages did not coincide in the Soviet Union and in the USA. In the USSR atomic weapons and missiles were created more or less simultaneously. In the USA, aircraft was initially assigned the main role as the carrier of nuclear bombs, and some time passed before the change was made to missiles as the chief means of delivery.

Nuclear weapons are still being improved. There are two trends in the further development of these weapons. One of them consists in the creation of nuclear charges of smaller power intended for operational-tactical purposes. The other trend is to create charges having a power of many megatons. These are thermonuclear bombs equivalent to 20, 50, 100 and more million tons of TNT. The Soviet Union has large stockpiles of charges of small and colossal power.

The third stage of the revolution in military affairs began in the USA and the USSR almost simultaneously. This stage was characterised by the comprehensive automation of military equipment, the automatic control of equipment and the combat actions of troops, the intensive introduction of scientific knowledge into the military field, notably for the control of the troops.

The development of automated control of troops in scale and scope will undoubtedly revolutionise all of military affairs, will make it possible to resolve many of problems in a new way. Only an overall automation of the control of troops and of the means of engaging the enemy will promote the maximum use of the possibilities inherent in nuclear weapons and other modern military equipment. The means of control must correspond to the new means of destruction and means of delivery.

The further development of the revolution in military affairs is characterised by the maximum utilisation of the achievements of scientific and technological progress, the introduction of scientific knowledge in the actions of the armed forces, in the training and education of the troops and in the preparations for possible military action. The modern stage of the revolution has to do with improvements in the scientific leadership of the troops, of military matters as a whole.

The present revolution in military affairs was unusual also because it proceeded in peacetime, in the absence of military

action. The two atom bombs exploded by the Americans over Hiroshima and Nagasaki at the end of the Second World War contributed little to the art of war. It was only in later years, when the mass production of nuclear missile weapons was begun, when the Army and Navy were re-equipped and the servicemen retrained, that radical changes were made in military theory. Thus, the new military theoretical propositions have been checked experimentally only in peacetime conditions.

The present revolution is also extraordinary because it, as distinct from the revolutionary changes brought about by the introduction of fire weapons (which affected mainly the tactical sphere and had an impact on the operational sphere only much later), began essentially in the strategic sphere and simultaneously transformed the operational and tactical sphere as well. This, in particular, explains the speed of the changes in the military field.

The modern revolution in military affairs began and continues on two diametrically opposed socio-political bases and under divergent ideological influence. This left its mark on the rate and trends of the changes in military affairs, and, which is most important, on the form of the changes. In the USA the revolution in military affairs reflected the deepening contradictions of capitalism, the sharp competitive struggle between the biggest monopolies. This was reflected, for example, in the lag of the second stage of military-technical changes behind the first: nuclear weapons were manufactured considerably earlier than were rockets—the means of their delivery. The biggest aircraft monopolies and other monopolies associated with them successfully resisted the production of rockets for a long time. The striving to suppress the national liberation movement in "limited" wars plays a major role in the development and improvement of nuclear weapons of small power. The profits involved in the production of electronic and other technical devices acted as a catalyst and accelerated the advent of the new stage in the revolution in military affairs.

In recent years, under pressure of the monopolies and the military, a plan was adopted and is being implemented to accelerate the development of weapons. The US ruling circles attempt to attain military technical superiority over the Soviet Union.

In the Soviet Union the revolution in military affairs has from the very beginning had the full support of the people and is being carried out under the leadership of the Communist Party and its Central Committee. As a result the changes in the military field have a planned and purposive nature, and material and human resources are used more economically and more effectively.

The carrying out of revolutionary changes in this field has once more confirmed the indubitable advantages of the Soviet military organisation over the military organisation of the imperialist states. Modern weapons were designed and produced in ample quantities in a very short time, the Army and Navy were re-equipped, the servicemen, notably the command cadres, were retrained; at the same time a Soviet military doctrine was worked out to suit the present level of military matters, and military science was further developed.

The Communist Party concentrated its efforts not only on supplying the Army and Navy with modern weapons and combat equipment. Relying on the objective processes conditioned by the successes in the building of communism, and the further consolidation of the socialist state, its greater role in the world, the Party succeeded in increasing the political awareness in the Armed Forces, in strengthening the conviction and determination of the Soviet soldiers, in making them even more devoted to their country and the communist cause. The general and military technical standards of the men, sergeants and officers have also risen considerably. The changes in the quality of the personnel of the Soviet Armed Forces makes it possible constantly to maintain the necessary combat readiness and combat efficiency of the troops.

The most specific feature of the present-day revolution in military matters is the enormous influence it exerts on social life, on all the aspects or elements of the state's military power.

It was already evident in the past that the transformations in military affairs exert a strong influence on social relations by changing their form. Frederick Engels said: "... the introduction of firearms had a revolutionising effect not only on the conduct of war itself, but also on the political relation-

sh p of dom nation and subjection [1] It helped to smash feudalism and promoted the victory of capitalism

The present revolution i i military affa rs has an even bigger effect on social relat ons In t ie past changes in military affairs affected only separate count ies those in wh ch they were taking place now however they affect the fate of many peoples, of all of mank nd Moreover the modern revolution in military alfa is forms part of the content of our epoch, comprises a definite aspect of it It has important economic and socio-pol t cal consequences which are ind ssolubly l nked with the ma n content of our epoch—the revolutionary transition from cap talism to socialism Therefo e its influence on the military potential on the m l tary power of states (coalitions) is enormous and many-sided

Influence of the Revolution in Military Affairs on the Military Power of States and on the Military Potential

By interacting with the econom c, scientific and moral-political potentials, the revolution in military affa rs has changed the mil tary potent al Having undergone qualitative changes the m litary potential has given the military power of states (coalitions) a new form has introduced structural changes into it Hence, the revolut on in m litary affairs exerts a determinative influence on the foundations of the m litary m ght of states (coalitions) and on the m litary potential *per se* naturally with due account for their nature and the concrete cond tions

Against the background of the bas c soc o-pol t cal problems of today the revolution in military affa is has proved the military-economic supremacy of socialism over capitalism and lent dynamic qualit es to the relation of forces in the world

On the one hand the revolution in m litary affairs has clearly revealed the anti-humane essence of capitalism its inability to use the achievements of scient fic and technological progress in a ratio nal way to cope with the modern productive forces It further intens fied the tendency of capitalism to move towards its doom under the burden of m l-itarism The revolut on in m litary affa rs in the cap tal st countries reveals the internal laws of the movement accord-

[1] F Engels *Anti-Duhring* Moscow 1969 p 200

ing to which, as Engels said militarism, like any other histor cal phenomenon perishes as a result of its own development

Th s is vividly proved by the concrete ind ces characterising the development of the capital st countr es notably that of the USA. Some bourgeois economists and politicians adm t that imperial st circles have turned m litary expenditure into an important lever of regulat ng the agg egate demand stabil s ng the econom c s tu at on and prevent ng crises The prom nent US econom st John Galbraith points out that the growing role of the Federal Government in the economy is linked primarily with the arms race During t ie 1930s he says, expenditures for nat onal defence (e .clud ng those for veterans and interest) amounted to between 10 and 15 per cent of the administrative budget In the f rst half of the sixt es they were between 55 and 60 per cent... If a large public sector of the economy, supported by personal and corporate income taxat on is the fulcrum for the regulation of demand, plainly military expenditures are the pivot on which the fulcrum rests [1]

In 1937 the military expenditure in the leading cap talist countries was $25 per head of the population in 1968 it amounted to $396 in the USA, $121 in France, $98 in Great Britain and $87 in the FRG [2] Speaking of the impact of the threefold revolut on (the cybernetic military-technical and the struggle of the Negroes for civil rights), the authors of the book *Manifesto of the Special Committee of the Threefold Revolution* (among whom are such scholars as Linus Pauling R Theobald and others) declared that the antagonisms of capitalism had intens fied They said that the modern syste n of industrial production was no longer viab e since the revolution in the productive forces led to a growth of social contradictions

On the other hand, the revolut on in military affairs has opened the eyes of the world to the progressive character and genuine humanism of the socialist system its cr sis-free development, its planned and purposeful nature Even though the revolution in m l tary affa rs requ red no l ttle efforts of the

---

[1] John K Ga bra th *The New Industrial Society* Boston 1967 p 229

[2] *The Mil tary Balance 1969-1970* p 57

state, it showed that the socialist system possesses resources that enable it simultaneously to develop the national economy and to maintain its defensive might on the required level.

While the build-up of nuclear missile power by the imperialist countries intensifies international tension, pushes the world to the brink of war, the growing military power of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries acts as a factor for peace, as a factor for historical progress.

The revolution in military affairs has not only demonstrated the economic and military supremacy of socialism over capitalism, but accelerated the change in the relation of the forces in the world also in moral-political respects. The polarisation of social forces in the capitalist countries proceeds to some extent under the influence of the revolution in military affairs—it places the group of monopolists on one pole and the whole nation on the other. The threat of nuclear war changes the consciousness of the peoples of the world and consolidates them in the struggle for the prevention of war.

The leading role of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in social transformations, in the struggle for social justice and for universal peace is a factor of enormous significance. This factor is on the side of the armies of the socialist countries and it acts against the armies of the imperialist states.

The revolution in military affairs carried out in the USA has intensified the aggressiveness of imperialism in general, notably that of US imperialism, and made its policies particularly adventuristic.

At the same time the revolution in military affairs poses the problem of a sharp and unexpected change in the relation of forces in war. This is an entirely new element in history. It obliges us to adopt a new approach when evaluating and maintaining the military power of states, the combat power of the armed forces. In wars of the past a considerable quantitative superiority in forces over the opponent (at least a three-fold one) often secured the successful outcome of the armed struggle, but now this has changed. *Now not only quantitative superiority, but also qualitative superiority over the opponent has become a matter of prime importance.* This applies mainly to the superiority in military equipment, in

new weapons in the organisation of the troops in their training in their political and moral maturity and combat qualities etc.

The revolution in military affairs has not changed the correlation between *man* and *weapons* fundamentally As before man and weapons constitute a dialectical unity of opposites They are a unity because man (the soldier) does not exist without military equipment and weapons which are his artificial organs while the latter are part of his specific functions

There have however, been certain changes in the interaction between man and weapons This naturally does not mean that weapons have become independent of man that man has become their appendage a robot as many sociologists and military theoreticians in the West are fond of saying Nuclear missile weapons have enormously increased man's power but they have not replaced him various cybernetical and computer devices reinforce man's intellectual powers but they do not and cannot replace his creative abilities The colossal increase in technical possibilities has vastly heightened the role of man's ideological, moral-psychological readiness to act in conditions in which nuclear weapons are invoked The psychological effect of these weapons raises the role of the moral element of the armed forces combat power The enormous possibilities of the new equipment have put higher demands on the soldiers military technical standards.

Only under socialism can man's moral and spiritual qualities develop in step with the advances in the military field, under capitalism the development of the former lags far behind the spectacular revolution in weaponry

The revolution in military affairs has shown that in Soviet social conditions the radical material and technical changes in the military field do not contradict the formation of a new spiritual make-up in the soldier, his comprehensive development In other words a harmonious development of both revolutionary aspects of the process has been achieved in the USSR—of the new weapons and of man who is their master Things are different in the bourgeois countries The changes in equipment and weapons there did not and could not be attended by a spiritual growth of the servicemen, by the strengthening of their morale This means that the moral

function one of the most important elements of combat power, has entered into a more acute contradiction with the other elements A comparative appraisal of the present military power of states should not fail to take this into account

The revolution in military affairs prompts the armed forces of states of the same type to unite their efforts creates conditions for the internationalisation in the military field In the imperialist camp this tendency is intensified by the ideology and policy of anti-communism The socialist countries on the other hand, are faithful to proletarian internationalism and jointly oppose the forces of imperialism. They coordinate their military efforts in every way, taking due account of the possibilities of the probable opponent

These are some of the most important consequences of the revolution in military affairs But, as we noted above, the revolution is continuing It puts new and greater demands on the economy, on science on the moral possibilities of states (coalitions), and on their armed forces. The revolution in the military field has made the individual elements of the armed forces' combat power even more independent, but has at the same time increased their mutual dependence.

2 MATERIAL AND TECHNICAL ELEMENTS OF THE ARMED FORCES COMBAT POWER

The armed forces' combat power and, hence, the military potential of states (coalitions) have acquired a new form notably because of the radical changes in the material and technical basis of military affairs, which directly reflects the level and the character of the development of the productive forces, science and technology.

Evolution of the Army's Technical Equipment

History shows that the ability of troops successfully to wage combat to inflict blows and repel attacks to take actions to force the enemy to capitulate or to destroy him, depends, first and foremost, on the military equipment, on weapons. The more perfect they are and the more efficiently they are used, the sooner and the fuller can the aims of combat actions be achieved

The simple methods and forms of combat corresponded to

the negligible destructive power of the side-arms and primitive mechanisms used in combat at the dawn of history The battle was generally a single combat while changes in its course and in the supremacy over the opponent were attained either by a simple numerical superiority of troops or by better preparations and equipment (armour), or else by better organisation and skill in operations on the field of battle

Although the development of firearms was a revolutionary leap in the development of military affairs the means of combat changed but litt e initially even when smooth-bore weapons (guns, cannon) were applied The sole difference was that cannon and later also small-arms fire were used in attacks The battle formation remained in the main the same as before—monolithic linear However, even in these conditions the more far-sighted and skilled generals were able correctly to assess the possibilities of the new weapons and to evolve new combat methods These qualities distinguished for example, the generalship of Peter I, Rumyantsev and especially Suvorov

Only the great improvement of firearms (the accuracy of fire range and rate of fire) to such an extent that a trained rifleman could h t his target at a considerable d stance changed the combat methods and made war increasingly a firing competit on

The advent of rifled firearms led to a sharp increase in the importance of rifle and artillery fire and to a corresponding decrease in the importance of side-arms Th s was typical already of the combat actions in the wars at the turn of the century especially the Austro-Prussian (1866), Franco-Prussian (1870-71), Russo-Turkish (1877-78), Anglo-Boer (1899-1902) and Russo-Japanese (1904-05) wars Columns vanished from the battlefields and combat was waged mainly by l nes of riflemen. whose advance was supported by artillery fire

The use of natural cover to take shelter from the fire later the digging in on the battlefield, the extensive use of field fortifications, the development of artillery, later of machine-guns, increased the importance of concentrated fire in the destruction of enemy forces.

The sharp increase in the application of concentrated small-arms and gun fire in combination with the extensive

use of field fortifications in the First World War resulted in the adoption by the warring armies of positional forms of combat Losses from fire were exceedingly heavy The art of war reached a deadlock The old combat methods proved ineffective new ones could not be created overnight

New methods of offence and mobile means—aircraft and notably tanks—offered a way out from the deadlock Aircraft and tanks were fully developed during the Second World War At the same time artillery and automatic weapons found wider application Artillery fire and aerial bombing became the main means of destroying the enemy The application of air force and airborne landing troops together with mechanised and motorised troops considerably extended the field of battle drew the areas in the rear into the sphere of operations boosted the role of space and further heightened the importance of the time factor Combat actions developed at an unprecedented rate

In the course of the Second World War the trend to raise the combat power of the main means of destruction came clearly to the fore—it involved the growth of the calibres of the artillery and increase in the rate range and accuracy of gun fire in the power of shells and aerial bombs At the same time there was a drop in losses from the fire of individual weapons, especially at great distances although small arms became mainly automatic

After the end of the Second World War however, the dominant trend was to create thermonuclear weapons and also suitable delivery and control means

The age-old content of armed struggle—the clash of the belligerents armed forces—was supplemented by direct and exceedingly effective action against the enemy's rear This is an objective reality that is, one independent of people's theoretical views or wishes

Modern combat means have an enormous destructive power and owing to rockets also an unprecedented range and accuracy There is no spot on the globe now that is not accessible to ballistic missiles.

The rapid development of missile equipment has changed the former significance of such combat means as piloted aircraft, cannon artillery, and big surface ships This alters the correlation of the services, the share of the different arms of

the serv ces their role in combat operations and the war as a whole

In a world thermonuclear war the whole planet can become a battlefield and all its aerial space can become the theatre of operations Combat actions will be conducted not only at the front but will extend simultaneously to vast areas on the ground and in the oceans, depriving the old concepts 'front' and 'rear' of their conventional meaning Blows will be delivered not only against troops but against the entire territory of the enemy, in order to disorganise and destroy his industry, transport communications, towns and population

Fire and Mobility the Main Elements of the Combat Power of Troops in Technical Respects

The development of fire weapons naturally raised the role of fire in combat and advanced the art of war The role of fire has become particularly great in modern conditions

Its power was formerly used in operations of a tactical and operational scale Even in the past war the mass fire of all weapons served mainly as a sword of Fire as it were in the offensive and as a shield in defence It helped consistently to destroy the enemy's manpower and equipment on a comparatively narrow sector The zone of destruction by fire limited by the comparatively small range of the weapons moved deeper into the enemy positions as the attacker's battle formations advanced As heretofore attacks were prepared by fire which also supported offensives mounted by armoured troops and infantry This preparation and support were supplemented by the fire delivered by long-range artillery and particularly air force But the strikes at the enemy's rear were limited by the comparatively small range of bomber aircraft

In modern war fire has become the main element in the blows delivered at the opponent Fire in the form of nuclear explosions has become a strategic factor that substantially influences the course and outcome of the war as a whole, not to mention individual operations and battles Nuclear charges are able to destroy the battle formations near and remote reserves of the opponent, military objectives spreading over vast areas in the enemy's rear A few such charges equivalent to millions of tons of TNT can paralyse an entire

country Therefore, in the presence of nuclear weapons and means for their almost immediate delivery on target, the fire possibilities of troops have become the basis of their combat power

Major operational aims and strategic results are likely to be achieved mainly through simultaneous nuclear strikes at the whole depth of the enemy's disposition, at all the key objectives in his rear

It could be said that formerly military actions proceeded gradually 'from bottom to top'; now, however, they can proceed simultaneously and depend on the results of the strikes made "from the top to the bottom" (by "top' we mean direct fire strikes of strategic importance)

From strategy to tactics, fire generally constitutes the main content of combat actions and is the most effective means of resolving their main tasks At the same time in modern warfare the *mobility of troops* has, alongside fire power, become a factor of prime importance Mobility can be tactical, operational and strategic

Mobility, when it has to do with the movement of battle formations on the battlefield, is called tactical Operational mobility is the ability of the mass of the troops to move during combat operations, as well as during periods between actions, from one field of battle to another. Thus, operational mobility is determined not by the rate of the movement of battle formations but mainly by the ability of troops to carry out marches and wage combat actions without losing their fighting efficiency. The latter depends not only on the endurance of the soldiers and their physique but also on their supply with foodstuffs and materiel Heavy horse-drawn trains supplying the troops with the requisite means of sustenance and means of combat, generally limited the operational mobility of armies before mechanised means of transport were evolved In those days operational mobility actually coincided with strategic mobility, i e, the ability of large masses of soldiers to move on the theatre of operation

The emergence and development of mechanical transport means (first of railway, then of automobile transport) increased the strategic mobility of armies The latter entered at first into sharp contradiction with the operational and tactical mobility that had remained on the former level. This can be

seen from the experience of the First World War Operations that were carried out slowly, by the method of consecutively 'eroding" enemy defences, inevitably petered out because the attacker s power was rapidly exhausted while that of the defender grew quickly because he could bring up reserves by rail and partly by motor transport

The situation changed only when the armed forces were motorised and mechanised Motor power made the troops extremely mobile Armies were supplied with large numbers of tanks and motor vehicles Aircraft also became a major factor adding to mobility, and its extensive use made it necessary to abandon the traditional views on time and space in combat actions

Since it has now become possible to bring on destruction by fire simultaneously over wide areas and at great depth the mobility of the troops has become even more important It determines their ability rapidly to take advantage of the results of nuclear strikes, in order to rout the enemy and to seize the territory on which his forces are disposed This is promoted by the ever more extensive use of such means of transport as aircraft helicopters tanks armoured carriers, cross-country vehicles, etc

Formerly the superiority in the mobility of troops was expressed only by their ability quicker to concentrate on the battlefields to create more powerful and more compact groupings, and to secure the support of a sufficient number of artillery pieces Later mobility became associated with the rapidity with which success could be exploited the effectiveness with which the retreating enemy could be pursued and the lead could be gained in reaching definite objectives. Speed is also important when reserves are moved to the front from the rear, and when troops are regrouped

The great mobility of the troops (made up of arms of the services in a proper combination equipped with powerful combat means) brought about by the revolution in the military field, enables them to conduct operations at rapid rates on individual sectors, quickly to disperse troops in anticipation of enemy nuclear strikes, and just as quickly to concentrate them again for further action. Mobility largely decides the ability to deliver unexpected strikes at great depth to destroy the enemy peacemeal, to foil his attempts to consolidate at favourable positions when retreating etc.

Hence, nuclear power in combination with the mobility of the troops is now the main technical factor characterising combat operations, it determines the manoeuvrability of combat operations and the war as a whole.

The mobility of the troops depends also on the means and methods of control, that is the rapidity with which information is obtained and decisions are adopted and conveyed to the troops

Formerly a general could observe the course of the battle and direct the operations of his troops with a wave of his hand', then little time was needed to obtain information to adopt decisions and to convey them to the troops At the time when the generals had no other means of communications and control but aides and orderlies on horseback the operational and tactical mobility of troops was also very limited

The discovery of the telegraph, then the telephone and finally the radio made it possible to control large masses of troops over a vast theatre of operations and even on several theatres The further development of radioelectronics. the application of computers, of better devices and apparatuses opens up new prospects in this field

Strength of Troops Because of the insufficient power of weapons fire superiority over the enemy was achieved during the Second World War by the concentration of large numbers of weapons (rifles, machine guns mortars, guns tanks and aircraft) on the most important sectors of the front Each side strove to achieve superiority over the enemy by concentrating a greater number of people and especially fire weapons on the sector from which it intended to launch an attack Simple quantitative superiority was often preferred to manoeuvrability However, much time was needed to concentrate a mass of weapons on a comparatively narrow sector so that it was often necessary to sacrifice the element of surprise and the flexibility of battle formations This complicated control and the concentrated grouping vulnerable to fire from all kinds of enemy weapons

Nuclear weapons, capable of hitting vast areas make it unnecessary to concentrate large masses of troops on a narrow sector Moreover compact groupings become an excellent target for the enemy's nuclear strikes.

Thus it can be assumed that modern operational-tactical groupings of troops used to mount combat actions and ope-

rations on individual sectors will be much s naller than they were in the last war. This does not mean h wever that the numerical strength of the armed forces will not grow during the war.

The numerical strength was determined in d fferent epochs by the population figure, the development of mater al production the social system and the financial possibilities of the state

In the epoch of early feudalism the armies formed by knights wei e small (only from 800 to 1 000 knights took part in battles then considered b g) The feudal decentralisation the limited aims of wars, and the high cost of weapons prevented a growth in the numerical strength of the troops During the period of absolute monarchies the armies generally did not exceed several tens of thousands of men because the state could not afford to support b gger armies

The small strength of armies was also due to the difficulty of troop control in the absence of technical means of communication Besides the specifics of linear tact cs and the long drilling that was necessary to train the troops for combat made it difficult to have large numbers of tra ned reserves

Following the French bourgeois revolut on the armies grew much bigger, since recruiting was effected on the basis of conscription Also, the more complicated equipment required preliminary training and the amassing of human reserves ready for action in case of war

The armed forces of the belligerents reached great numerical strength during the Second World War In modern conditions when nuclear weapons and other means of destruction may be used, it is still necessary to have big regular armies This is dictated by the character of modern war the decisiveness of its aims, the unprecedentedly large territories involved, the complex and numerous equ pment and weapons used the high percentage of losses the importance of defend ng the entire territory of the country in conditions when aerial means of destruction and air-borne landing forces w ll be used the greater role of communications their greater length and the necessity to defend them

At the same time there is also an opposite tendency towards a considerable limitation of the strength of the armed forces. Military production will need even more skilled labour than before, the more so that the labour force may, as

the population as a whole suffer huge losses from nuclear strikes More people will be engaged also in organising uninterrupted transport, in restoring destroyed objectives, etc

The socialist countries are able to use their human resources much more effectively, purposefully and systematically during war than are the capitalist countries

Organisation of Troops

The organisation of troops is the scientifically grounded and experimentally tested form of combining people and weapons for their most effective application in combat

The modern armed forces of a big state consist of different services and arms The services are rocket forces land forces, air defence forces, the navy, and the air force. The arms of the services in the army are infantry, artillery and armour, in the navy—the submarine and surface vessels naval air arm, etc , and the special troops (engineers, signals, chemical defence, railway troops, etc) These categories formed historically and have undergone a continuous evolution in their equipment and organisation. Thus, until recently the land forces consisted of the infantry, cavalry artillery and a number of special arms In the First World War they were supplemented by tank forces During the Second World War cavalry lost practically all its importance, while the infantry was greatly motorised, as were also all other troops. Rocket-powered weapons have begun to account for a much bigger share in the artillery, while cannon artillery has changed qualitatively and has become highly differentiated

Even more far-reaching changes were made in the structure of the armed forces after the Second World War As we mentioned above the decisive role was assigned to the strategic missile forces Missiles became the main means of destruction in the land forces as well, while infantry was completely mechanised, and now uses vehicles for travel and even for combat The importance of tanks and motor vehicles has grown. Artillery has changed qualitatively In the air force the role of bomber aircraft has decreased, its key functions having been taken over by various missiles Surface ships (especially big ones) have lost much of their significance, whereas the role of submarines has increased. A special role is assigned to the air defence troops, whose prime task, in addition to destroying the enemy's aircraft, is to fight his missiles.

The structure and organisation of the armed forces have also changed considerably Organisation has the aim of securing the successful solution by all troops of their combat tasks while preserving their controllability and co-operation

As before, so in modern conditions the organisation of army units and formations is affected by different often contradictory, demands. Every unit and formation must have the maximum of combat power, independence the ability to wage long and intense combat A necessary condition for this is maximum mobility, the importance of which can hardly be overestimated However, the demand for mobility which can be secured only if the troops are unencumbered and possess a very flexible organisation clashes with the above demands, since the more effective means are often difficult to transport, require a cumbersome support and supply apparatus etc

A definite quantitative and qualitative correlation between the different types of military equipment creates the armament system The number of artillery to the number of troops in infantry, the number of tanks to the number of all other combat means, the relation between the different calibres of the field artillery etc all this is strictly determined All these ratios are interdependent and may undergo substantial changes if the quality of the given type of armament improves, if its effectiveness rises, or if there is a marked change in the other conditions affecting warfare

As a result the armed forces assume an organisational pattern that is determined by the development of production and depends on the system of views the given state holds on the nature of war and the methods of warfare

Training Standard of Troops

Even technically very well equipped troops cannot be considered strong if they are badly trained and their level of combat readiness is low, that is, if they are unable quickly and with great military skill to carry out the combat tasks assigned to them. *The fighting efficiency of the troops is made up of their high material status, high training standard and high combat readiness Only troops perfectly equipped and possessing a high standard of combat readiness for action in complicated conditions can be considered efficient The concepts of fighting efficiency and combat readiness are thus indissolubly linked.*

The content of military training changes all the time and

becomes ever more complicated because of a number of social factors as well as because of the fact that the troops have to master ever more complex weapons and combat methods In the age of nuclear weapons, missiles and electronics it is highly important that all servicemen should possess adequate engineer ng and technical knowledge

A soldier must not only master his combat equipment and weapons to perfection but must also know the equipment of the enemy

Even though the importance of numerical superiority should not be belittled it obviously plays a lesser role than the training standard of the troops their combat experience their skill to fight at any time of the year day or night in any weather conditions The history of wars abounds in examples illustrating the above

The small but well-trained Russian armies led by Rumyantsev and Suvorov smashed the vast Turkish armies Excellent mastership and military skill were shown by units of the Soviet Guards troops in the violent battles of the Great Patriotic War

The training standard of the troops is composed of the training standard of the individual soldiers sub-units units and formations

Individual training even if its standard is very high is not enough by itself Under feudalism every single knight was extremely efficient But there was no order in the armies at that time and the elementary qualities marking a smoothly functioning military organism were missing The linear battle formation of the troops of Frederick II was considered perfect in those days Yet outside of that battle formation the Prussian soldiers were practically unfit for combat

In our time of perfect military equipment a low level of individual training is just as intolerable as the absence of smooth teamwork within units and sub-units The high training standard of the soldiers must correspond to the demands made upon it by modern war, must take into account the present level of military equipment and its development trends

Commanding Personnel

The standard of troop training, their high fighting efficiency and constant combat readiness their will for combat, high moral and political maturity—all this depends largely on the personal qualities of their commanders and chiefs

At all t mes and in all armies the commanding personnel has been the backbone of army organ sat on the bearer as it were of m litary science and traditions Therefore the tra n-ing of officers, their special knowledge methodolog cal sk ls the r art of conduct ng military operat ons play a ma or role in the atta nment of victory. A commander of any rank must not only fulfil the will of his senior officer accurately and in a disciplined way, but must also be a skilful and enterpris ng leader and educator of his subordinates By his decisiveness abil ty to evaluate the situation and quickly to find the best ways of ach eving success he must inspire the troops with re-doubled courage

Particular importance is acqu red by the qual t es of the officer corps in modern wars. when, in addition to pol t cal awareness, officers are required to possess a h gh level of general and special training, display except onal decisiveness endurance and initiative creativity and heroism The person-al qualities of commanders of all ranks are fostered in them in special military educational establishments and during their pract cal activity

The modern armed forces are an enormous organisation consisting of highly skilled experts The great amount of technical equ pment placed at the disposal of modern a mies has greatly changed the nature of mil tary activ ties One must not draw a l ne, as in the past, between the command-ers the bearers as it were of military knowledge and the m l tary technicians and engineers who generally acted as advisers, consultants and executors of concrete narrow pre-dominantly tact cal-technical tasks At present the two as-pects in the mil tary profess on, i e , the purely mil tary and the eng neer ng-technical and the activity of commanders of all ranks should be represented in harmonious un ty s nce it is practically impossible to d stingu sh between them At the same t me the commander was and remains a skilled m litary expert the educator of his subordinates

S nce the rational use of military equ pment dec des the success of the armed struggle the art of us ng it in combat and for tra ning purposes in peacetime requires a deep knowledge of technology and also of the natural sciences, notably mathematics in comb nation with a knowledge of the fundamentals of military science and its special sub ects A matter of the greatest importance to the commanding person-

nel is correct operational-tactical reasoning, the ability to foresee the course of events, the ability to adopt quick decisions and to implement them, strictly and systematically to control the progress made in their execution

The specific features of combat action in modern conditions oblige officers not only to display personal initiative, but also to develop and encourage the initiative of their subordinates in every way, constantly to infuse into them high political and combat qualities and a high morale.

Contrary to pseudo-scientific racialist theories about superman the qualities of the commanding personnel depend on the social environment, historical experience, political and moral education. The personality of the commander is formed by the entire system of ideological influences, the organisation of social life and the way of life in general, by the school art, literature, the training and education in military educational establishments, in the army.

The business, professional and moral-political qualities of the officers in the Soviet Army (as also in the armies of the other socialist countries) are determined first and foremost by their Marxist-Leninist world outlook, by their deep awareness of their duty to the state and the Party. This world outlook is formed by the CPSU, which has created the first ever Socialist Armed Forces and educated commanding personnel for them with patience and care. Soviet officers are boundlessly devoted to the Communist Party and their country, are excellently trained in military and technical respects and able to maintain the high military preparedness of the Soviet Armed Forces. No bourgeois army has personnel that is so devoted to the people, so experienced and battle-hardened

3. MORAL ELEMENTS OF THE TROOPS' COMBAT POWER

To give a correct evaluation of the fighting efficiency of an army we must have an idea not only of its equipment, but also of its discipline, of its firmness in combat, of its ability and readiness to endure the hardships of war and, especially, of its ". .. morale, i e., what can be demanded of it without demoralising it '.[1]

[1] K Marx and F Engels, *Selected Correspondence* Moscow, 1966 p 184

By morale we understand the specific manifestation of definite political, moral ideas, sentiments views, some of which hold a dominant position in people's consciousness, and lend a definite qualitative characteristic to the spiritual forces of the soldiers. Roughly, the moral factor can be characterised as a state or condition in which there prevail low or high spirits, confidence or confusion, enthusiasm or apathy, etc

In some of his letters and telegrams written during the Civil War Lenin emphasised that after the blows delivered by the Red Army a feeling of doom, fear, confusion and apathy was reigning among the interventionist troops In characterising the morale of the fighting revolutionary masses he widely used such terms as passion', 'enthusiasm', 'anger', 'hatred', 'fighting mood', 'elation of the masses", etc, wh ch aptly emphasised the various shades of the moral factor.

Speak ng of a case of a forced retreat he sa d that 'holding out morally means not allowing oneself to become demoralised and disorganised, keeping a sober view of the situation, preserving vigour and firmness of spirit, even retreating a long way, but not too far, and in such a way as to stop the retreat in time and revert to the offensive".[1]

It should be noted that many generals and military theoreticians of the past, such as Peter I, Suvorov and Kutuzov, recognised and appreciated the importance of the army s morale Napoleon said that as regards their importance the spiritual forces relate to the physical as three to one. Clausewitz maintained that 'it is the moral magnitudes that permeate the whole element of war' and that will, being a moral magnitude is what "sets in motion and leads the whole mass of forces'. He wrote. ".. physical phenomena appear almost exclusively as the wooden handle, while the moral ones are the precious metal, the finely sharpened weapon'[2]

Why does the morale of fighting armies play the decisive role in war? This is mainly because danger is the typical element of war. In other spheres of human activity the aim is to gain some success, and death is due only to some mishap, is accidental and generally rare, but at war death is natural.

---

[1] V I Lenin, *Collected Works* Vol 33 p 116

[2] Karl Clausewitz *Vom Kriege*, Dresden, 1885, S 124, 125

Any military assignment every step during an offensive every day of defensive action involve the sacrifice of human lives Therefore the more death-dealing the weapons, the greater the role played by the morale of the people drawn into combat

Lenin formulated a proposition that can be considered one of the most important and general laws of war He said *In the final analysis, victory in any war depends on the spirit animating the masses that spill their own blood on the field of battle* [1] (Author's emphasis) This law comes particularly sharply to the fore in wars where one of the sides pursues just and the other predatory aims It will assert itself with new force in a world nuclear war if one should break out

The morale of the army plays a decisive role in the war because as a material force it can raise or lower the fighting efficiency of the troops Only if morale is high can all the hardships of the modern armed struggle be endured and military equipment be used with the greatest efficiency Low morale damages the fighting qualities of the troops Thanks to high morale the professional skills of troops transform into genuine mastership which can be attained only if a creative attitude is displayed and is impossible where the military duties are fulfilled as a formality *A high morale cements the other elements of the combat power of the troops, multiplies their strength*

A high morale increases the flexibility of the organisation and hardens the will of the troops strengthens discipline which steadily grows more essential as the technical means of struggle the methods and forms of warfare become more diversified and the political aims of the struggle grow more decisive

Specifics of the Army's Morale

As regards its nature the morale of troops is closely linked with the moral-political maturity of the entire population is a component part of the morale of the population of states (coalitions), and simultaneously expresses the specific features of the army as an organisation whose main aim is to combat the enemy

---

[1] V I Lenin *Collected Works* Vol 31 p 137

Morale should not be regarded as a clan spir t of profes-sionals or as *esprit de corps* as many bourgeois military theo-reticians do

It is also wrong to regard morale only as a manifestation of moral qual ties and convictions, it is more complex and diverse The ma n and decisive content of the morale of an army is made up of the aggregate of political and moral ideas sentiments and feelings shared by the uniformed masses and expressing their attitude towards the genuine in-terests of the country and the people, towards the socio-politi-cal system and the policy of the state and in time of war, also towards the war aims An essential aspect of the morale of an army is the attitude towards the enemy, the intens ty of the hatred of him, the extent to wh ch the army wishes to fight him and to exert all its powers for victory, as also the depth of the awareness of its military duty and the confidence in its power All these components of the morale of troops are closely interlinked in dialect cal unity Hence, *as regards its essence, morale is the ability of the soldiers to fulfil their military duty to the end* It finds a concrete expression in the maturity and fighting efficiency of the troops

The level and strength of the morale of the troops are de-term ned by a number of conditions The more general and basic of them were d scussed in the preceding chapter

A specific group is formed by the conditions that affect the morale and are contained in the army itself and in the na-ture of combat action. They exert a pos tive or negative in-fluence notably on the psychological components of the mo-rale, on the sentiments of the soldiers, and in definite condi-t ons also on the political att tudes and morale as a whole

Military equipment that is superior in quantity and quality to that of the opponent, a h gh standard of tra n ng of army units excellent mastery by them of modern weapons their fighting experience exert a part cularly great influence on the state of troops The convict on of the servicemen that their means of combat are superior to those of the enemy lends them additional strength

For morale to be h gh, the decisions adopted by the officers must be rational and purposeful their organisational activity perfect, especially that connected with troop control, with maintaining co-operation between the services and the arms, ensuring reliable communications and constant and contin-

uous supply of the units with ammunition and other requisite materials The commanding personnel must be up to the requirements of the war—that is an important factor for strengthening morale

The psychological and in definite conditions also the political-moral state of the troops is subject to vacillations depending on the course and results of military actions When the troops are winning one victory after another it is much easier to maintain a high morale than it is when they are suffering defeat and are forced to retreat Offensive operations help to raise the morale of the troops, especially when a powerful offensive or counter-offensive is mounted after a long defence Attack always affects the psychology of the enemy s troops for it shows that the attacking side s will is stronger than their own The morale of the troops is subjected to a hard test when the opponent uses the element of surprise launches an offensive unexpectedly uses a new weapon or new methods of warfare, succeeds in a military ruse etc

'Psychological warfare exerts an important influence on the morale of the troops It consists of ideological subversions aimed at undermining the moral and political basis of the army s combat power at demoralising the troops at eroding their faith in their political and military leadership

All the above conditions interact The socio-political system of the state the ideology dominant in society, the war aims and the moral quality of the human material form the basis of the morale and political maturity of an army Defeats weaken the will for victory of troops possessing a low morale In troops with a high morale defeat evokes a feeling of shame pain bitterness it does not undermine their spirit but strengthens it.

Troops with a low morale are so sensitive to losses that they frequently become unfit for combat even after suffering slight setbacks On the other hand, troops with a high morale exhibit the greatest heroism they are able to hold out to the end, possess a high offensive spirit and maintain strict discipline Troops realising that they have a social duty to fulfil and whose actions are dictated by their conscience are able to endure far greater physical and psychological stresses than troops who adopt a formal attitude towards their military duty. Among the latter discipline is based first and foremost

on coercion fear and bribery which is supplemented by the ideological indoctrination of the soldiers This lowers the r init ative weakens their will for victory stops them from us ng the r moral and physical strength to the full)

Courage bravery and heroism can be displayed by soldiers on a mass scale can become a standard of behaviour n combat only if they are l nked with noble ideals w th the conv ct on that the purpose of the army and its war a ns correspond to the interests of the people, the genu ne interests of their country.

The psycholog cal features necessary to transform the recruit into a regular sold ei can be developed only on such a moral-pol tical basis Every profession every special ty, exerts a defin te effect on the psychology of the people following it Th s appl es also to the military service which is associated with definite cond tions created by the soldiers collective These conditions are specific because the life and activity of the units and sub-units are strictly reg mented every soldier feels that he is l nked with the collect ve by jo nt activity, the community of interests, trad t ons, etc All this influences the psychology of soldiers This influence has a telling effect on the psychological make-up of the soldiers because their moral-psychological qualities are not only of professional but also of political importance

All the above factors determine the level of the army s morale neither spontaneously nor automatically They only create poss bil ties, favourable or otherwise for maintain ng th s sp rit on the necessary level How successfully these favourable possibilit es are realised and unfavourable ones overcome in the arm es of the socialist countries depends on the activity of the commanding personnel, the pol t cal bod es the Party and Komsomol organisations In this Party-political work has a particularly important role to play

Specific Features of the Influence Exerted by the Combat Situation on the Morale of Troops

To ensure a high morale in the army in a modern war should it be unleashed by the imperialists it is essent al to take into account also the new circumstances that make far greater demands on the morale of the troops They evolve from the nature of nuclear war, from the qualitatively new character of military actions as regards their mil tary-technical and political aspects

The troops must be fully prepared morally even before the outbreak of the war The aggressors stake on a sudden attack on the USSR, on "pre-emptive" nuclear strikes at Soviet political centres industrial areas and transport junctures, at key military objectives This makes it necessary for the troops to be constantly ready for combat already in peacetime, to give maximum attention to preparing the soldiers in moral-psychological respects When the war begins there will be no time for a gradual preparation, for the transition from peacetime to war conditions The logic of modern war is such that a soldier must be ready to face its trials in advance In all past wars the final moral tempering ' the baptism of fire , was achieved in the course of operations Now one cannot rely on that even if the war should begin with conventional weapons Even then the troops will have to conduct intense fluid operations and to be constantly ready to use nuclear weapons and to defend themselves against them. The transition from one kind of combat action to the other, from conventional to nuclear weapons, will require enormous moral staunchness

The picture of combat in a nuclear war will have an enormous moral-psychological effect on the belligerents They will witness huge losses among the population and the troops heavy damage, will experience the destructive effects of l ght and sound waves, of rapid changes in pressure, may find themselves in areas flooded because of the destruction of dams, etc All this will inevitably be a mental shock and can inflict a heavy moral blow, one particularly difficult to bear in the first minutes and hours of the war. It is not to be discounted that the instinct of self-preservation, the fear of death, will at that moment take hold of some of the soldiers Fear evokes a state of depression and panic among people who are not morally tempered The manifestation of a weakness of the spirit by some people is no less dangerous than are elemental forces The loss by some soldiers of control over their feelings is intolerable, even if such cases should be few, for negative psychological reactions are extremely infectious A person who is unable to control himself is unable to control mechanisms efficiently and makes mistakes in handling equipment. The damage that may be caused by a mistake in modern war is difficult to overestimate

Increased demands upon the moral qualities of the soldiers

are posed by the ext eme fierceness of the armed struggle by the high mobility of combat operations the absence of cont nuous front-lines and the necessity to pass through extensive zones of radioactive contamination destruction fires floods, etc

The sharp increase in the danger of possible acc dents in combat which will take place at night or in conditions of poor illumination in smoke or dust clouds w ll inev tably g ve rise to a feeling of uncertainty i n s always has an extremely depressing effect and erodes people s morale

Alarm and uncertainty can also be aggravated by the constant danger from invisible radioactive bacteriolog cal and chemical weapons One must also be prepared for the possible application by the enemy of fundamentally new k nds of weapons In past wars it was found that the sudden employment of a new weapon can have an extremely negative effect on troops not prepared for it It is impossible to make provisions against the psycholog cal damage from suddenness which in definite cond tions may exceed the material damage caused by the new weapon The scientific and technological revolution may produce new weapons so unexpectedly that the effects from their use are difficult to foresee with any degree of accuracy

The higher demands upon morale are due also to another feature of modern war—a large part of the servicemen will not see the enemy, he will remain invisible Many soldiers will regard the enemy as something 'abstract". However, despite the remoteness of the enemy, despite thousands of kilometres, his death-dealing breath will be felt everywhere This aggravates moral stresses It is therefore essential to find some sort of a 'moral safety valve" for the servicemen Alarming, oppressive thoughts can be suppressed by active preparations for combat, the checking of the equipment, weapons, etc

The striving to improve the protection of the troops and to increase their mobility finds expression in the trend to give the troops the protection of armour, to build deep underground shelters, etc However, this may intensify the feeling of partial isolation, especially because in modern war the action of individual units and sub-units in isolation from the headquarters, from the main forces, without sufficient information will probably be the rule rather than the exception

In modern combat ultimate victory will possibly be won by small courageous teams Hence the soldiers must be able to carry out any combat task be able rapidly to advance over vast distances fight without contact with their neighbours remain cool and level-headed in any situation no matter how complex display courageous initiative take daring risks and deliver steadily intens fying blows to the enemy Naturally such actions can be taken only by troops possessing an invincible will-power

Huge irreplaceable losses are a typical feature of nuclear-missile war The outcome of battles will depend first and foremost on the losses the troops will be able to susta n w th-out losing their fighting spirit on their courage and the will to carry on the struggle

In addition to the measures taken to lower the vulnerability of the troops to weapons of mass destruction it is important to foresee the psychological and moral consequences the application of such weapons may entail Th s causes grave concern to the bourgeois military leaders

In nuclear war military discipline its moral basis will be all-important No army can exist without strict discipline but when modern combat means are applied it must be even firmer

How to maintain a high morale after the initial nuclear str kes and during further combat operations is a problem of extreme complexity The troops must be ready to advance to break the enemy s resistance remembering that he too has suffered heavy losses This readiness must not be impaired by the heavy losses sustained from the nuclear strikes of the enemy, it must remain firm even if only separate composite groups or detachments survive of the former sub-units units and formations

To be able to endure a moral blow of unheard-of strength it is necessary for every soldier on every sector or every post to direct all his strength thoughts will and feelings to the task on hand to concentrate all the time on the carrying out of his tasks of his duty, not to allow even a moment of slackness When one has concentrated one s will and directed it at the faultless operation of the weapons equipment, various apparatuses and mechanisms, the feeling of terror evaporates and its place is taken by the excitement of combat, by a moral upsurge an offensive spirit

In the most difficult moments especially those immediately follow ng a nuclear str ke it is extremely necessary to provide an external st mulus the personal example and firm command of an officer the confident word of a political worker, a Commun st The role of the commanders and political workers of all ranks will be decisive in maintaining and reinforcing the morale of the troops

The purposeful activity of all soldiers (based on communist ideas and high mil tary mastership) and the active influence exerted on their consciousness and psychology by the commanders and polit cal workers w ll ma ntain the r morale on a high level and help them to fight and win

Moral-Psychological Training of Troops on a Scientific Basis

The obvious moral superiority of the socialist over the imperialist armies is due to causes of a socio-economic and ideological nature But the strength of the morale is determined also by the actions of the mi tary leadersh p the combat readiness and political maturity the education of the soldiers and the ent re way of army life

For morale to be given a definite structure an influence must be exerted on all its elements one that takes into account their specific features and the fact that they are interdependent The 'moral and psychological tra ning of the troops cannot be separated Such train ng must be a moral-psycholog cal one one that through the moulding of a communist world outlook a remoulding of man s psychology forms the essential moral and combat qualities educates patriotism and internationalism prepares the sold er-citizen for the trials of modern war.

The essence of the moral-psychological training consists in the purposeful formation of moral-psychological firmness in the servicemen, of the constant readiness to endure the grimmest trials of modern war and to vanquish the enemy This is achieved by the entire system of political education and combat training, by moral and military education

Lenin s propositions and v ews on the problem of preparing man for war can be formulated and expressed as definite principles of the moral-political and psychological training of the troops in modern conditions

The first of these principles is the systematic work to educate commun st consciousness and conv ctions in the Soviet soldiers It is influenced by a variety of factors First of all

this is the influence of the social environment of circumstances the real living conditions that mould the personality In the broadest sense this could be called the influence of the Soviet way of life, which has a number of specific features as applying to the army A major role belongs also to the organisation of a harmonious system of instruction and education Finally, an important factor is man s ability for self-education self-instruction the ability to approach selectively the influences to which he is subjected When all these factors act in the same direction in a co-ordinated way the formation in the soldier of a communist personality will obviously succeed

Another important principle in the moral-political and psychological training of the troops is *the unity of the ideological and psychological influence* on man's consciousness in the course of training and combat activity

The strengthening of the ideological impact of the Party's influence on the ranks can accomplish a major ' psychological shift" in the necessary direction The spiritual state of the masses and the army should be considered in the entire wealth of its shades, both ideological and psychological

Relying on Lenin's heritage, as applying to the problem of the moral-political and psychological training of the troops we can formulate one more principle It expresses the objective need to *use to the maximum the achievements of science* in the process of preparing the "human material for war

The present level of the development of science and technology makes it possible to give people a more adequate idea of what may happen in modern war This can be achieved in particular with the help of a special set of physical models of combat in a nuclear missile war They can consist of technical devices such as special chambers, simulators, three-dimensional zones, etc Each of these devices can create (with a maximum degree of accuracy) the illusion of real combat, of its dangers, rapid changes of situations, uncertainty, and can also help the soldiers simultaneously to experience (within reasonable limits) increases in temperature, noise, light flashes, etc With the help of such devices the moral-psychological combat readiness of the soldiers can be tested and repetitions of such treatment can help to work

out and strengthen this read ness It is advisab e to have many models so that they become increasingly compl cated and make the testee gradually approach real conditions as closely as possible The most complex models can have a series of different programmes The degree of sim larity between the model and real conditions is determ ned by the des gner's intention and the technical possibilities of realising that intention Such models should be designed jointly by engineers psychologists physicians, military experts etc The use of such models should be regarded as a specific form of practice as a definite criterion for verifying theories which formerly were tested only by war

It is essent al to teach the soldiers to control the r behaviour to mould in them a constant internal read ness for active combat operations for mass heroism

We cannot agree with the assertion that in the war of 'machines and robots" there will be no place for heroism 'Modern technology has destroyed this concept" some US sociologists aver This is not true The point is that in modern conditions the concepts 'heroism" and exploit' are filled with a new content Heroism and exploit are not only a bright manifestation of the finest qualities of the intentions of one outstanding person Heroism in modern war will be manifested ever more fully in the unity of the individual and the collective This will be the heroism of crews, groups units and at times it will assume the form of arduous and accurate work with machines mechanisms and apparatuses in the most difficult combat conditions, often requiring self-sacrifice the fulfilment of tasks at the cost of one s life We see elements of this heroism already today in the performance by men of combat duty in the ma ntenance of constant combat readiness, which requires the straining to the utmost of all their intellectual physical and moral powers.

Modern war demands a keen and flexible reasoning by all soldiers from privates to generals the ability to assimilate diverse information immediately. A creative frame of mind is a factor of great importance, it enables the soldier to evaluate what is happening in a flash, to foresee what may happen and to adopt suitable decisions A conservative mind one unable to create, is generally quickly paralysed by great moral-psychological stresses

Modern war makes it necessary to *educate a soldier ready for action, resolute to the point of daring* The level of a person's resolve is most vividly manifested in complicated critical situations It is essential for him to keep a cool head and to act decisively at such times

First-rank importance is attached to working out a moral-psychological staunchness and endurance that is the ability to endure extreme physical and psychological stresses and shocks without losing the will for struggle and victory Physical endurance is directly dependent on moral-psychological endurance

Modern military equipment and weapons and the character of the nuclear-missile war call for a combination of discipline and self-discipline for man must be able to control himself even better than he controls mechanisms and devices Modern combat requires an excellently and smoothly functioning military collective that includes a large number of officers and men of diverse specialities Therefore the morale that welds the officers and men in a single military collective is crucial in modern conditions This does not belittle but heightens the role of the individual the cell of the single whole

Military discipline and its highest expression—self-discipline—are indicative of the moral strength of the troops A strengthening of the ideological conviction of the soldiers makes them fulfil their tasks not only because of orders and coercion but also because their reason and feelings command them to do so that is because they are self-disciplined The deeper a soldier realises their necessity, the more willingly does he carry out the demands of the service Self-discipline makes it possible to control one's feelings, to master them and to suppress momentary attacks of weakness

Such qualities as self-control self-sufficiency and insistence are also vital to the soldier in modern war The absence of even one of these qualities makes the soldier inadequate in fighting efficiency and morale

The best ways of working out a high morale are intense combat training long naval cruises flights in difficult conditions, forced marches, the launching of missiles Training and exercises make it possible to resolve a dual task—to work out and develop the necessary qualities and also to reveal the weak points of every soldier tardiness, timidity,

excess ve impressiveness lack of self-control, etc and by rationally choos ng individual tasks and exercises to help the men get rid of them If such qualit es are ' d scovered ' in combat it w ll be much more d fficult to remedy them

It is expedient in the process of moral tempering to create situations entail ng-an element of risk (but of a risk controlled by the commander) The outstand ng Soviet educator A Makarenko was right in saying that ' one cannot educate braveness in a person if he is not placed in cond tions in wh ch he can display his courage [1]

When dangerous situations emerge sufficiently frequently stable reactions are worked out in the soldier's mind the soldier reacts more and more calmly to unexpected complicated situations copes w th them calmly, gets used to the feeling of danger as a necessary and unavoidable element of military life

Naturally it is impossible to simulate accurately the cond tions of modern combat but attempts should be made to approach them as closely as possible A skilful s mulation of a combat is no less important today than it was before It is advisable to use such methods as the running over ' by tanks the firing over the heads of one s troops, the showing of educat onal and documentary films giving a life-like imitating modern battles the action of modern weapons and their destructive factors because then they will not come fully unexpectedly when encountered in real combat

We must not confine ourselves only to the existing programmes of combat tra ning in the moral-psychological preparation of the troops There must be exercises of a special nature to train the will self-control and psychological firmness of the sold ers of all arms, taking into account the specifics of their service The systematic training on simulators, the working out of the ability of ' self-mobilisation", the creat on of a sound moral atmosphere ' in the collective crew or sub-unit will promote the moulding of the necessary morale and fighting qualities

In view of the nature and specific demands of modern warfare it is advisable to improve the system now used for the *professional selection* of soldiers for some specialities charged

---

[1] A S Makarenko *Sobraniye sochinenii* v 7 tomakh (*Selected Works* n seven volumes) Moscow 1958 Vol V p 424

with special responsibilities in conditions when time is extremely limited and tasks have to be fulfilled under great emotional stress More importance should be attached in selection to the physical and psychological traits of the individual, to his professional inclinations character, temperament, the speed of his reactions, his attention, his ability to pull himself together and other qualities

A harmonious system of military-professional selection is the more essential now since a speciality has to be acquired in a very short time and in tense conditions Such a selection makes it possible to form the special sub-units of people who are able to handle modern equipment with the greatest efficiency

The above mentioned trends naturally do not exhaust all the forms of work aimed at strengthening the morale and at hardening the spiritual qualities of the troops The task of maintaining constant combat readiness—the central problem in the activity of the Armed Forces of the socialist countries in peacetime conditions—demands maximum harmony in the development of the technical and spiritual aspects of combat readiness

Thus morale transforming in the course of military actions into a material force, is the decisive factor But this proposition should not be understood one-sidedly and in an over-simplified way The morale of the army, no matter how high, is not the only factor securing victory. An important role is played also by material-technical factors

Hence, victory in modern war is determined by all the elements of the combat power taken together, in aggregate and what is most important, by the ability and skill of the political and military leadership to use all these elements to the greatest effect

4 DEVELOPMENT AND CHANGE OF WARFARE METHODS

The methods of warfare and the war in general are an important indicator of the political and military leadership's skill in using the combat power of the armed forces for the victory over the enemy. Being ultimately dependent on the level of the state's military power and the combat power of

the armed forces the methods of warfare are at the same t me cond tioned by a number of other essential factors One of them—the revolution in mil tary affairs—has already been discussed Now we shall look into the mechan sm under y ng the change in the methods of warfare and the main causes and conditions determining the character of those methods now becoming dominant

Conditions Determining the Development and the Change in Methods of Warfare

Frederick Engels was the first to evolve the famous formula that expresses t ie most important law determining the change and development of methods of warfare 'Armament composition organ sation, tactics and strategy depend above all on the stage reached at the time in production and on communications It is not the free creation of the mind of generals of genius that have had a revolutionising effect here but the invention of better weapons and the change in the human material, the soldiers at the very most the part played by generals of genius is limited to adapting methods of fighting to the new weapons and combatants [1]

Let us note that attempts were made at one time to replace Engels s formula by the formula 'As the mode of production so the mode of combat The argument advanced to justify this change was that methods of warfare depend not only on the development of the productive forces, but also on the character of the economic system, that is, on the people s relations of production This is an argument not easily dismissed Yet without belittling the decisive role of the development and change in the mode of production in world history, Engels s formula is more accurate while the proposed formula oversimplifies the question of the development and change of combat methods and is somewhat schematic as well

Engels s formula expresses not the general dependence of the method of warfare on the productive forces and relations of production but their dependence on the cond tions directly determining the armed struggle. After all, the productive forces and the relations of production ultimately determine all aspects of social life without exception According to Engels the methods of warfare are determ ned first.

[1] F Engels *Anti-Duhring* Moscow 1969 p 200

by the weapons at the disposal of the troops and, secondly the character and the qualities of the mass of the people drawn into the war. Engels noted at the same time that the change in methods of warfare is influenced also by the qualities of men, by national and some other socio-demographic specifics.[1]

The productive forces and relations of production naturally influence the methods of warfare, but only through the medium of two important factors—weapons and people. Therefore there is no direct and immediate dependence of the methods of warfare on the nature of the productive forces and relations of production.

Besides, the formula about the direct dependence of the methods of warfare on the mode of production often gives rise to the totally erroneous view that every mode of production has one, and only one, method of warfare that is characteristic of it.

The question whether several methods of warfare can correspond to one mode of production is an important one. It is essential to a better understanding of the development of the art of warfare in the past and its prospects in the nuclear missile age.

The question can be stated as follows: is a bourgeois state, for instance the USA, able to work out a completely new method of warfare, one corresponding to the new weapons, or is it compelled to resort to the methods of warfare used during the Second World War? This question applies also to the socialist state.

What is the task facing the socialist state? Should it develop and improve the methods of warfare that were used during the Great Patriotic War, or create new ones corresponding fully to the changing conditions?

The history of wars shows that within a single mode of production, for example, the capitalist, methods of warfare changed repeatedly: some withered away, others changed, still others were created anew. This is only logical, since the modes of production embrace whole historical epochs, while the methods of warfare are indirectly connected with the mode of production in a variety of ways and change com-

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 205.

paratively rapidly. Thus, the methods of fighting that were used in the Franco-Prussian war, differed considerably from those used in the Napoleonic wars.

The methods of warfare include methods for waging battles (tactical scale), operations (operational scale) and methods for waging campaigns and the armed struggle throughout the war (strategic scale). Quickest to change are generally those used to wage battles, and in their wake the methods to wage operations. They may change repeatedly not only within the framework of a mode of production, but even in the course of a big war.

During the Second World War different states used different methods of the armed struggle: nazi Germany applied the Blitzkrieg strategy, Britain and the USA, the strategy of drawing out the war. Yet in all these states there was the same capitalist mode of production.

Influence of Social Revolution on Methods of Warfare

The deepest changes in the methods and forms of the armed struggle are wrought by social revolutions. This is because social revolutions radically change the aims of wars, the personnel and the morale of armies, and thus evoke far-reaching changes in the military sphere, in the entire military system. These revolutions either evolve new methods of warfare or make a deep imprint on the existing ones.

We mentioned above the radical changes wrought in military affairs by the French bourgeois revolution at the end of the 18th century. "Just as within the country the revolutionary people of France had then, for the first time, displayed revolutionary energy on a scale it had never shown for centuries, so in the war at the close of the eighteenth century it revealed a similar gigantic revolutionary creativeness when it remodelled its whole system of strategy, broke with all the old rules and traditions of warfare, replaced the old troops with a new people's revolutionary army, and created new methods of warfare."[1]

At the same time there were cases in history when armies evolved by the revolution fought counter-revolutionary armies with the same methods of fighting that were used by the latter. This, for example, happened during the English bour-

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, p. 400.

geois revolution of the mid-17th century, when Cromwell's army was able to rout the royalist troops because of its higher morale. But this army used the old methods of warfare which did not essentially differ from those used by the royalist troops.

In his article "Possibilities and Prospects of the War of the Holy Alliance Against France in 1852" Frederick Engels wrote that the proletarian revolution would create a special military method, a new method of warfare. At the Eighth Party Congress Lenin called for the mastery not only of modern military equipment but also of modern methods of warfare.

It should, however, be emphasised that a *revolutionary army, even if it uses the existing methods of the armed struggle, uses them much more effectively, for it fights for just aims and has an incomparably higher morale.*

During the Civil War of 1918-1920 the new social nature of the Workers' and Peasants' Red Army determined the essentially new methods of warfare applied by it. They were marked by manoeuvrability and resolve, the striving to look for solutions by launching active offensive operations, the extensive application of strike groupings (for example, the offensive of the Southern Group on the Eastern Front, the attacks by the legendary First Mounted Army, etc.).

Hence, in studying the methods of warfare used by the armies of the socialist countries it is essential to make a concrete analysis—on the basis of historical facts—of what aspects of the methods of the armed struggle are completely new as compared with the art of warfare of the imperialist armies, and what methods they have in common, taking into account the changes made in them by the socialist armies and the greater efficiency resulting therefrom.

During the Second World War the Soviet Army, the armies of Britain and the USA, and even the army of nazi Germany used many identical methods of warfare on a tactical and operational scale. For example, the methods of breaking through the enemy's defence, of introducing tank and mechanised formations into the breach and the exploitation of the success were in the main almost identical because identical weapons were used by all those armies. However, the combat actions of the Soviet Army, even

when it used methods identical to those used by the armies of the imperialist states, differed in some essential features.

What are these distinguishing features? They were aptly and vividly stated by Lenin in the following formula: "Marxism differs from all other socialist theories in the remarkable way it combines complete scientific sobriety in the analysis of the objective state of affairs and the objective course of evolution with the most emphatic recognition of the importance of the revolutionary energy, revolutionary creative genius, and revolutionary initiative of the masses—and also, of course, of individuals, groups, organisations and parties that are able to discover and achieve contact with one or another class."[1]

If we translate Lenin's proposition into military language, we can determine the main distinguishing feature of Soviet military art (strategy, operational art and tactics) as the *organic combination of a high offensive spirit with an all-round evaluation of the situation, the relation of forces and the full supply of the requisite means for combat. The principle to attack the enemy only when one is sure of success, does not exclude, but presupposes the need of taking risks, even big risks, when this is required by the situation.*

The Soviet art of war proceeds from the assumption that a real basis for decisive offensive actions and the achievement of victory over the enemy exists only if the aims and plans for military operations coincide with objective possibilities, reserves are created and skilfully manoeuvred and the material and technical support in battles and operations is well organised.

This specific feature of Soviet art of war is in full keeping with the dialectico-materialistic world outlook of the Communist Party. It is determined by the lofty aims facing the Soviet people in wars against aggressors, by their invincible morale and unshakeable conviction in victory, and also the advantages of the socialist system in mobilising all resources for the needs of the war. The Communist Party has always advanced and implemented courageous and extensive plans, based on a strict scientific analysis of the concrete historical conditions of social development in every given epoch.

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 13, p. 36.

It should be noted that two different approaches can often be discerned in the policies of the bourgeois parties and governments, and also in the leadership by them of the armed struggle: an adventurist pursuit of aims which greatly exceed real possibilities and are therefore unattainable, or else an opportunistic refusal to take decisive actions, i.e., the tactics of "minor operations", a "pinching and scraping", i.e., delaying tactics and inertness. These different approaches could be clearly seen in the policy and strategy of nazi Germany, the USA and Britain during the Second World War.

The aims and tasks set to the nazi troops sharply fell out with the resources at Germany's disposal and with the relation of forces between that country and her opponents. The nazi strategists attempted to overcome these contradictions by mounting sudden attacks and sweeping offensives without sufficient reserves. Having at first scored major successes, the German fascist troops finally suffered complete defeat in the war against the Soviet Union. The adventurism of nazi Germany's policies led to adventurism in the conduct of the war.

The British and US governments, proceeding from the interests of the monopoly bourgeoisie of their countries, strove to defeat Germany by shifting the main burden of the struggle on the Soviet Union in their desire to weaken that country as much as possible. In the pursuit of this aim the British and US governments did all they could to draw out the war. The policies of Britain and the USA also determined the style of the military operations of their armed forces. These operations were conducted extremely cautiously and slowly. The combat tasks assigned to their troops were far below the possibilities of the USA and Britain.

The Changes and Upheavals in Methods of Fighting— a Result of the Progress of Military Equipment

Military equipment, particularly weapons play a special role in the changes and large-scale upheavals in methods of warfare.

The invention of a new weapon or a considerable improvement of an existing one leads not only to the gradual change of the art of warfare, but is able, under certain conditions, to bring about a major upheaval in tactics and even in strategy, to give birth to entirely new methods of warfare.

What conditions are these? How do military equipment

and weapons bring about radical changes in the methods of the armed struggle?

The invention of new military equipment does not yet result in a change in the methods of warfare. Only the mass production of the new weapons and their massive employment in combat can bring about a revolution in the art of war. This is, in fact, a manifestation of the well-known law of dialectics—the transition of quantity into quality. It should be noted in this connection that not every accumulation of weapons, but only the accumulation of a definite, highly effective weapon, can bring about a radical change in the methods of the armed struggle.

For a given state to launch the mass production of a weapon able to revolutionise the art of war, it must have a well developed and mobile industry. But even that is not enough. It is also necessary that industry should receive orders from the army for the production of the new weapon well in advance. To do this the political and military leadership must realise the value of that weapon and the effects of its employment in good time.

If the new weapon is employed only on a limited scale it cannot change the methods of fighting radically. This is illustrated, for example, by machine-guns, which were first used on a limited scale during the Anglo-Boer war of 1899-1902 and later in the Russo-Japanese war. At the beginning of the war the Russian army had 8 machine-guns, towards its end—374. They were far too few to influence the course of the war and military art.

A different situation arose during the First World War. Hundreds of thousands of machine-guns were put out by the industries of the belligerent countries. Alongside with the use of quick-firing weapons and the system of trenches protected by barbed wire, the machine-gun was instrumental in effecting the change from manoeuvring to positional methods of warfare, especially on the Western front.

The introduction of tanks took a somewhat similar course. Their appearance on the battlefields of the First World War did not substantially change the methods of warfare. This was because, first, tanks were relatively few, and second, they were extremely imperfect: were slow and their range was limited. Moreover, the troops had not yet fully adapted their tactics to the new weapon.

In the period between the two world wars tanks were greatly improved and the industries of the major countries started putting them out in growing numbers. During the Second World War their production skyrocketed. Between 1914 and 1918 all the warring states produced less than 10,000 tanks, while during the Second World War Germany produced over 65,000, the USA over 85,000 and Britain over 25,000 tanks.

The improvement of tanks, the expansion of their production, and their mass employment in combat were the material basis that gave birth to new methods of fighting during the Second World War. As distinct from the First World War, tanks were no longer used only as a weapon for the close support of infantry during a breakthrough of the enemy lines, but became an independent strike force able, in co-operation with aircraft, to exploit this breakthrough in order to achieve major operational and strategic aims, to carry out long raids into the enemy rear, to cut his communications and to surround his troops.

During the First World War tanks had not yet become an independent arm of the service and their use was entirely subordinated to tactical tasks, whereas during the Second World War a reverse process unfolded—the tactics of infantry, artillery and the other old arms of the service were beginning to adapt themselves to the new weapon so as to secure the most effective use of armour.

All this is an expression of an important law governing the development of military art and revealing the mechanism of the changes in the methods of warfare:

first, new weapons do not immediately push the old to the background, but for some time coexist with them;

second, new weapons are generally first adapted to the old weapons and to the tactics corresponding to those old weapons;

third, new weapons acquire independent and major importance only after they have been sufficiently improved and produced in large enough numbers;

finally, the old weapons are increasingly subordinated to the characteristics of new weapons and the new methods of warfare corresponding to them.

The history of military art, especially in the 20th century, when military equipment develops extraordinarily rapidly, shows that a new weapon emerging in the course of the war

is not used to the full during that war. It is fully applied and changes the methods of warfare only in the next war. This is explained by the fact that the duration of wars is generally shorter than the time needed to organise the mass production of the weapon, to utilise its tactical and technical qualities in combat conditions to the full, to change tactics and strategy, and also to reorganise the troops in accordance with it. This was the case with the machine-gun, which had such an impact on military art only during the First World War.

Tanks and aircraft were used during the First World War, but wrought a revolution in the methods of the armed struggle only during the Second World War. In that war new military equipment was used, such as jet-propelled aircraft and unpiloted planes, and even atom bombs. But, this new equipment did not substantially change methods of warfare (with the exception of radar).

In modern conditions the re-equipment on a large scale of the army and navy with qualitatively new weapons, new military equipment, has brought about a radical change in the forms and methods of warfare. It will be only logical to expect that in future too military equipment, new weapons, will create corresponding new forms and methods of warfare.

In discussing the mechanism of the change in the methods and forms of the armed struggle, we have to mention several other features. The choice of the combat method, the form of the armed struggle depends greatly on the balance of power immediately before the outbreak of hostilities and also during them. Experience shows that a considerable superiority in strength over the enemy makes it possible to choose and implement definite methods, generally offensive ones, while an insufficiency of strength makes it necessary to resort to different methods, generally defensive ones. A change in the relation of forces during the war leads to a change in the methods and forms of the armed struggle. The methods by which the troops and weapons are used in action depend also on the *geographical environment* at the theatres of operation. The geographical environment (climate, topography, weather, hydrology of the sea, conditions of the atmosphere and space, season, time of the day, etc.) always influences the operational-tactical and strategic actions of the troops.

The development of weapons and military equipment has

created conditions in which the geographical environment can become a method of warfare. For example, nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction can result in radioactive, chemical or biological contamination of huge areas on land, sea and in the air; nuclear missile weapons can change the course of military operations, interfere with the propagation of electromagnetic waves in the atmosphere, ionosphere and space and affect communications and the control on the battlefield.

The Role of Military Theory in Working Out the Forms and Methods of Armed Struggle

In modern conditions the elaboration of new combat methods or major changes in them do not proceed spontaneously. This is characteristic of the present stage in the development of military affairs. In modern wars a spontaneous adjustment of the methods of warfare to the variety of complex equipment is possible only with respect to the tactics of sub-units, and even then only in rare cases. *New methods of fighting can be evolved only scientifically by military-theoretical thought, which must rely on the comprehensive practical experience of the troops and generalise that experience.* This applies to the methods for the use in combat of all military equipment and all modern services and arms.

Military theory plays a major role owing to the specific relation between it and military practice—the source of its development and the criterion of its truth. The theories being advanced and worked out by military science can be properly tested only in the course of a big war against a strong opponent. But, such wars are rare, while military equipment develops comparatively rapidly in the periods between them. Therefore peacetime exercises are of great importance to the development of military theory.

The employment of new equipment in small wars gives an insufficient, one-sided, and often erroneous idea of its importance in a future big war. Yet, it would be dangerous for military science to disregard such experience. Military science naturally takes this experience into account and develops it with a view to its application in big wars. Therefore, the prevision of the character of the new war, based on the theoretical understanding of the trends underlying the changes in social conditions and military equipment, is extremely difficult, but it is vitally important.

For a long historical period military theory confined itself to generalising past experience. This, almost complete, disregard of the future did not have too great an effect on social and specifically military functions, since military affairs developed slowly, the technical basis and other material conditions pertaining to warfare changed gradually, and the generalised experience of past wars could therefore be used for a long time.

It will be remembered that during the feudal period generals found it useful to study the description of campaigns and wars of the remote past and made practical use of the experience of Epaminondas, Alexander the Great, Caesar, Hannibal and other great soldiers of the slave-owning times.

The generals and theoreticians of the capitalist epoch also relied partly on that experience, combining it with an analysis of the methods of such generals of the feudal-absolutist period as Turenne, Eugene of Savoy, Gustavus Adolphus, Peter I, Frederick II, Rumyantsev, Suvorov. The generalised experience of the wars of the epoch of the French bourgeois revolution and the Napoleonic wars formed the basis of bourgeois military theory and played a definite role in several wars of the 19th century waged by Prussia, Russia and other states.

However, bourgeois military theory was on the brink of bankruptcy when the objective conditions changed the means and methods of warfare so much that the generalised experience of the past and the adherence to classical patterns became inadequate. A scientific analysis of the new conditions was required as also the ability to foresee the development brought on by the rapidly changing situation in the armed struggle. For the first time this came clearly to the fore during the First World War, at the outbreak of which military science in all countries without exception was still in the grip of backward ideas and therefore unable opportunely to appraise the specific features of that war. The same can be said of French military doctrine in the period of the preparations for the Second World War.

In the past major mistakes made by military thought in the appraisal of the future war could generally be rectified during that war, now, however, entirely different conditions prevail. There may not be time in the course of a dynamic and highly destructive war to rectify mistakes made before

the war. Therefore, even in peacetime military science works out the most effective methods of employing super-powerful and superlong-range weapons, and also conventional ones.

By studying and generalising the experience of local wars, the directions and basic trends in the development of military equipment and weapons, and also by taking into account essential socio-political changes, military science forecasts the character of actions in the future war, the specific forms and methods of the armed struggle without, as well as with the use of nuclear missile weapons. The degree to which the changes in the forms and methods of warfare and the conduct of the war as a whole are based on science is therefore an important indicator of the level of the military power of states (coalitions).

* * *

Thus, an analysis of the military power of states, of its material and spiritual foundations, as well as of the military potential, shows that all their elements form a dialectical unity, and this makes it necessary to consider all of them comprehensively, and to use them in the defence of the socialist country against imperialist aggression.

Chapter Eight

THE MARXIST-LENINIST TEACHING ON WAR AND METHODOLOGICAL PROBLEMS OF SOVIET MILITARY THEORY

The high level of the defensive power, fighting efficiency and combat readiness of the Soviet Armed Forces is a result of the cognition and skilful utilisation by them of the laws of social and military development; it is based on the creative application of Marxism-Leninism, natural and military science.

The vital requirements of the defence of the socialist country, the developments in the military field, the maintenance of the high and constant combat readiness of the army and navy make it necessary to raise the scientific level of the leadership in strengthening the defensive capacity of the country, in training and educating the servicemen. This level depends on how deeply one is able to understand the objective laws governing social development in general and military affairs in particular, on one's ability to work out the most rational forms for the application of these laws.

An essential condition for the fulfilment of this task is the application of Marxist-Leninist philosophy to the military theory and practice, the solution of the problems of military science on the basis of the methodology of dialectical and historical materialism.

1. DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM— THE UNIVERSAL METHOD OF COGNITION AND REVOLUTIONARY ACTION. ITS APPLICATION IN SOVIET MILITARY THEORY

Dialectical and historical materialism is one of the three component parts of Marxism and is, in fact, its philosophical basis. It combines philosophical materialism and materialist dialectics (dialectical materialism) and historical materialism. This single philosophical teaching has definite facets and aspects. Dialectical and historical materialism is the science about the relation of thinking, consciousness to being, matter, about the universal laws governing the development of nature, human society and thinking. It is a philosophical world outlook that fulfils the functions of a theory of cognition, serves as a universal method of cognition and practical action. Marxist-Leninist philosophy is therefore of enormous importance in laying a basis for the policies of the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist Parties. It serves as the ideological and methodological basis for the development of science, including military science.

Relation of Marxist Philosophy to Science and Practice

The most important feature of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, one that distinguishes it from all former and present philosophical systems, is its *capacity for unlimited creative development and improvement.* The possibilities for the development of Marxist-Leninist theory and its philosophical basis are just as unlimited and multifarious as human experience. Marxist-Leninist philosophy develops in indissoluble connection with practice, with the struggle for a revolutionary transformation of the world, for the ideological purity of revolutionary theory.

Laying the foundation for the new world outlook, Karl Marx wrote: "The philosophers have only *interpreted* the world, in various ways; the point, however, is to change it."[1] This set a completely new task to philosophy—that of combining philosophy with practice, scientific communism with the activity of the working masses, with their struggle for the translation of revolutionary theory into practice.

[1] K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, in one volume, Moscow, 1968, p. 30.

With the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution the link between theory and practice acquired qualitatively new features. When the proletariat won political power and the possibility emerged for realising the ideas of Marxism on a country-wide scale, Lenin wrote: "... *the historical moment has arrived when theory is being transformed into practice, vitalised by practice, corrected by practice, tested by practice...*"[1]. (Author's emphasis.)

The connection between theory and practice has grown even deeper and more varied in form at the present stage of communist construction in the USSR.

The indissoluble link between theory and practice does not mean, however, that the difference between them has been abolished. It is fairly easy to resolve many urgent questions theoretically, but to resolve them practically is often a difficult, and at times an impossible, task.

In modern conditions the unity of theory and practice is reflected in the fact that the CPSU and the people as a whole combine theoretical and practical work in their activities, that theoretical principles are directly linked with practical ones, that they proceed from generalised practice and are translated into practice. The interval between the theoretical and practical solution of urgent problems has become much shorter, since there are no antagonistic social forces. Yet, this interval cannot disappear altogether.

Marxism-Leninism creates a theoretical basis for the solution of concrete problems and for the attainment of the ultimate aims of the working people's struggle. This unity is expressed in the Party policy.

The use of Marxist-Leninist philosophy for the solution of various problems is no simple matter. Historical experience shows that it is easier to learn definite propositions, formulas and principles of Marxist-Leninist philosophy than it is to use them creatively for the solution of theoretical and practical tasks in the various fields of knowledge and in human activity. Lenin noted that such "highly eminent Marxists" as Kautsky, Otto Bauer and others who had studied dialectics and taught it to others, turned out to be far from dialecticians when they applied them in life, in practice. To a great extent this applies also to Georgi Plekhanov, who did much to work

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 413.

out and disseminate Marxist philosophy but was unable to apply it to the new historical conditions, to life, to the practice of the international communist movement.

Thus, it is one thing to know the propositions and formulas of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, and quite another to apply them in science and practice. The latter requires special skill. In turn, this skill presupposes a sustained, strictly consistent devotion to the Party, the adherence to a class point of view.

The elaboration of Soviet military doctrine, which has generalised the military experience in our epoch, the emergence and development of Soviet military science, are organically linked with Marxist-Leninist philosophy.

The Application of Philosophy in Military Science and the Philosophical Problems of the Latter

It would be illogical to demand of philosophy the solution of questions that are the subject-matter of military science. It would be equally wrong to attempt to resolve specific philosophical questions of military science without philosophy. This applies with special force when the question about the essence and content of war in general, and nuclear war in particular, is being analysed. Though recognising the dialectico-materialistic definition that war is the continuation of politics by violent means, some authors attempt to reduce war solely to the armed struggle, ignore its political content and belittle other forms of struggle during the war. In the heat of argument some even begin to prove that Lenin's proposition on war being the continuation of politics by violent means has become outmoded. Others approach this proposition dogmatically and refuse to see the changes that can take place in the essence and content of war.

Such views are indicative of a one-sided approach to the solution of the philosophical questions of modern war, which are of crucial importance to Soviet military science. The reasons for such one-sidedness are not new. Their roots go back to the history of philosophy and other sciences.

Marxist-Leninist philosophy does not only study the general character of the interrelations between philosophy and the individual sciences, but also determines what there is in the individual sciences that has a philosophical content, how science should be approached from a philosophical point of view.

In Soviet military science philosophical significance is attached to problems having an ideological, methodological nature. A philosophical approach to scientific questions means that a study is made of the indissoluble links of the separate phenomena and processes in military affairs with social life, the general dialectical processes in the single but endlessly varied world. It is expressed in the analysis of aspects of military affairs which are of general importance in scientific knowledge. A philosophical problem, for example, is the question about the specific manifestation of the more general laws of the development of nature, society and thinking, and also the philosophical categories in the military sphere. This problem is linked with the problems of the regularities of wars and the methods of conducting wars, the correlation between the subjective and objective in the armed struggle, the interrelation between military theory and practice. Of ideological importance are also questions about the objective basis and causes of changes in the methods and forms of the armed struggle and the war as a whole, changes in the relation between man and equipment in the military field, the interrelations between the military collective and the individual, etc. There is a philosophical content in the aggregate of problems linked with the search for objective truth in military science.

Soviet military science resolves all its theoretical and practical tasks by adopting a conscious approach to philosophical problems of military science and by creating conditions for the application of Marxist-Leninist philosophy in the military field.

What conditions are these?

An essential condition for the creative use of Marxist-Leninist philosophy in military affairs is its deep mastery, a knowledge of its essence, the observance of all its demands and principles.

Marxist-Leninist philosophy is a guide for cognition and action, the soul of all sciences.

In addition to understanding what scientific philosophy can and does give to military science, it is essential deeply to know military science itself, its laws and principles.

Key military problems are analysed with the help of Marxist-Leninist philosophy. It must be used in its entirety and it is inadmissible wilfully to apply some formulas, prin-

ciples, laws and categories, while ignoring their relation to other principles, formulas or categories.

There are no processes either in nature or in society in which one single law of materialist dialectics operates while the others do not. There are no processes in which we could use one category without using all the other categories of dialectical materialism, for each category reflects only one feature or aspect, only some definite relations, etc., but does not give an understanding of the phenomenon in its entirety. This does not mean that we cannot analyse some single nexus (for example, the causal relation or that between necessity and chance), but even in that case the dialectical method is applied as a whole.

To embrace the world, scientific concepts must be flexible, mobile, relative, interrelated, inseparable though contradictory. Only in that case are concepts able to reflect ever-changing life, if they are not static, if they are in constant motion, if one constantly changes into another. Flexibility applied subjectively is fallacious. Flexibility applied objectively, that is reflecting all the aspects of the material process and its unity, is dialectics, is a correct reflection of the world's eternal development. This Marxist demand is of the greatest importance, always and everywhere, in everything. Serious negative consequences inevitably resulted when it was ignored.

Now that the revolution in military affairs has been sparked off and is developing, that methods of fighting have changed radically, it is particularly essential for the military to be able to use flexible and viable concepts in their reasoning. At the same time these concepts must not only be flexible and mobile, but also stable. However, the stability of the concepts must not exceed the stability of the objects, phenomena and processes reflected in these concepts. For example, some concepts of military science are now being filled with a new content, and this must be taken into consideration. Among these concepts are "co-operation", "meeting engagement", "manoeuvring", etc. At the same time new concepts have emerged—nuclear missile strike, nuclear missile umbrella, etc.

The dialectico-materialist approach to the understanding of war and its separate processes presupposes also the observance of the principle of the unity of empirical knowledge and logical thinking. These are two levels of knowledge, the

lower and the higher. The first gives us a knowledge of the phenomenon, the second a knowledge of the essence, of the laws governing the phenomena of the objective world This principle teaches the soldiers to use different methods for the analysis of empirical material, for its theoretical processing, and for testing the correctness of the propositions of military theory. It presupposes also a correct understanding of the relation between the objective and the subjective. Relying on the materialist views on the objective laws of war, Soviet military theory does not fetishise these laws, but teaches the military to apply them actively in the interests of the victory over the enemy. Thanks to this proposition it is able to develop creatively and to improve in keeping with changing conditions.

The Universal Method of Cognition and Its Application in Military Affairs

The concept "method" is a polysemantic one. In its most general sense "method" is the way towards the achievement of some aim, it is a means or aggregate of means used for the solution of some definite task. The number and character of scientific methods changed in the course of history in accordance with the development of human knowledge and social practice.

Some methods are general to many sciences (the method of observation, comparison, experiment). Every science, including military science, has also specific methods of its own.

There are methods commonly called logical ones. No science can do without them. They are the method of analysis and synthesis, induction and deduction, the method of passing from the concrete to the abstract and from the abstract to the concrete.

Among the multifarious methods of cognition a special place is held by dialectical materialism, which is a universal method. It is universal because it combines the methods of cognition and revolutionary action as an expression of the unity of theory and practice, of objectiveness and dedication to Party ideals. It is used in all sciences, is the basis and guiding principle for all general scientific and specific methods, is made concrete and realised by all these methods.

The dialectical method of cognition is the way of achieving the truth, the way of the movement of thought, corresponding to the more general laws governing the development of the

material world, to the nature of the objects, phenomena and processes of study Its role in the development of all sciences, including Soviet military science, grows incessantly. The universal method of cognition and practical action is important because it is needed first and foremost by science itself, which develops rapidly while simultaneously going through a process of differentiation and integration The growing importance of the universal method is conditioned also by the complexity of social practice in our highly dynamic and contradictory age. This is further determined by the internal laws governing the development of philosophy itself. Without reliance on dialectical materialism there can be no successful struggle against bourgeois ideology, against the ideology both of Right and "Left" revisionism and nationalism. The universal method is growing in importance also because of the revolution in military affairs. The rapid change of some of the concepts and categories of military science, the change in the content of others, the new character of the interrelations between the various elements in military science, the limitations imposed on military practice, which is the motive force of the development of military science and a criterion of the correctness of its principles, all this assails military science with questions which cannot be resolved without a general philosophical method.

The immediate aim of science is *truth*, the final aim—*practice*. Every genuinely scientific truth is quite simple but the road leading to it is intricate. Dialectical materialism makes it possible to attain truth in the shortest way, to avoid many zigzags and deviations from objective truth. Dialectical materialism is an analogue of reality. That means that it is nothing but *the conscious use in cognition of the most general laws of the development of the objects, phenomena and processes.*

The demands of the dialectical method of cognition are an expression of the main laws and principles of Marxist-Leninist philosophy as applied to the scientific cognition of the material world. In this field philosophical laws and principles sometimes act as prerequisites, sometimes as essential standards of reasoning, as its rules. Let us examine the principal ones of them as applied to military affairs.

The principle of *objectivity* is the essential and initial principle of all scientific knowledge, it is based on the re-

cognition of the objective nature of truth. As applied to military affairs this means that it is essential organically to combine a decisive, brave offensive spirit with a comprehensive objective evaluation of the situation and the reliable provision of all the necessary means required by the troops during action. This forms the realistic Party approach, which is directly opposed to adventurism, so typical of the policy and strategy of the modern imperialist states. *The scientific reflection of reality, the analysis of the objective state of affairs, a sober appraisal of the situation are the basis underlying Soviet military science and practice.*

The demand for *all-sided study* evolves from the fundamental principle of Marxist-Leninist philosophy about the unity of the world and universal interrelations, the mutual dependence of objects and phenomena of nature and society. It consists in the analysis of the entire aggregate of the links and relations of every object, every phenomenon and process with other objects, phenomena and processes. In order really to know an object it is necessary to embrace, to study all its aspects, all its links and "mediacies". Although this can never be achieved in full measure the emphasis on all-sided study helps to avoid errors and rigid attitudes. This demand finds its concrete expression in the Marxist-Leninist approach to war, which is regarded in all its aspects, in connection with its socio-economic and political sources and causes, in the unity of the armed struggle and the economic, ideological and diplomatic forms of warfare. It is embodied in the regulations and manuals, in the demands for an all-sided appraisal of the situation when operations, battles and combat are planned. *The strength of Soviet military science, its superiority over bourgeois military science, consists in the fact that it is guided by the Marxist-Leninist dialectical method and strives for the comprehensive study of all the principles and conditions securing victory over the aggressor.*

Several methodological demands evolve from the *principle of development.* The dialectico-materialist understanding of development, the general laws of movement, are a reliable general methodological basis for the solution of the fundamental problems of Soviet military science and practice. As applied to the process of cognition these laws act as important methodological demands.

The law of the mutual transformation of quantitative and qualitative changes obliges us to consider development in the military field in the unity of the quantitative and qualitative changes, in their mutual transitions. It enables us to understand the leap-like character of military development, the most profound expression of which is the modern revolution in the military field. Soviet military science, relying on dialectical materialism, correctly revealed the radical changes in military affairs, drew and continues to draw conclusions from them and to apply their results in the development of the Soviet Armed Forces, in the training and education of the personnel; it theoretically substantiates the application of new methods and forms of armed struggle in accordance with changes in military affairs.

The law of the unity and struggle of opposites, revealing the source of all development, gives rise to the general methodological demand which Lenin formulated as follows: "The *reflection* of nature in man's thought must be understood not 'lifelessly', not 'abstractly', *not devoid of movement, NOT WITHOUT CONTRADICTIONS,* but in the eternal PROCESS of movement, the arising of contradictions and their solution."[1]

War and military matters are distinguished by a particular contradictoriness. One cannot understand the socio-political content of every given war without first revealing the contradictions that have given rise to it. The armed struggle is a sharp contradiction, a duel of two opposing forces. Contradictions constantly emerge between weapons and military equipment, on the one hand, and the methods and forms of the armed struggle, on the other. The relations between defence and offensive, between the means of attack and the means of defence, between fire and movement, etc., are also contradictory.

Soviet military science is effective because it reveals the contradictions in military development consciously and opportunely and determines the ways and means for transcending them.

The methodological importance to military science of the *law of the negation of the negation,* which reveals the general trend of development, the relation of the old to the new in

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works,* Vol. 38, p. 195.

the development process, the spiral form of its ascendancy, consists in its demand for a critical, not a nihilistic, approach to the experience of the past, a critical and not nihilistic attitude towards bourgeois military science and equipment. It prevents military thought from stagnating and becoming rigid because it regards every stage in military development as a transition to a new, higher stage.

In studying the phenomena in the military field it is essential to use all the categories of dialectical materialism. Their choice and the form of their application are determined by the nature of the military phenomena being studied and by the tasks and trends of military-scientific research.

The supreme principle of the Marxist-Leninist theory of cognition is the quest for truth—the unconditional demand, strictly obligatory for any genuine science. Objective truth which does not tolerate the slightest distortion for any reason whatever is vitally essential in all spheres of activity, and in military activity in particular. A precise appraisal of the relation of forces is an unconditional demand of any scientifically based policy. The truth, no matter how unpleasant it may be, must be faced. A policy that does not satisfy this condition is doomed to failure.

Such are the most general demands of dialectical materialism, the universal method of scientific cognition. They are simultaneously the principles and laws of dialectical thinking. Being conditioned by the objective nature of objects and phenomena, they become an irreplaceable guiding star in all fields of scientific knowledge. The application of dialectical materialism, the general method of cognition, gives Marxist military science enormous advantages over bourgeois military science.

2. METHODOLOGICAL FUNCTIONS OF THE MARXIST-LENINIST TEACHING ON WAR AND THE ARMY

Being part of historical materialism, the Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and the army is closely linked with military doctrine and military science. It is, in fact, an intermediary link between dialectical and historical materialism and Soviet military theory. This teaching is the philosophico-sociological

theory of war and the army, is the philosophy of war. It fulfils important methodological functions in Soviet military doctrine and military science.

Importance of the Basic Propositions of the Marxist-Leninist Teaching on War and the Army

The methodological functions of that teaching can briefly be summarised as follows. First the Marxist-Leninist teaching is directly linked with the class struggle in the international arena and reflects the antagonisms of the contemporary epoch. It shows the direction of the actions of definite social forces, their strivings during developments particularly difficult for the people. As the popular masses become aware of the concepts expressing the ideals and aims of a just war, the latter materialise and, under definite conditions, become a military force. During the Civil War and the Great Patriotic War, the idea of the defence of the socialist country became a powerful factor contributing to the victory over the enemy. Military science, the political and military leadership naturally consider this during the armed struggle.

Second, the most important concepts of the Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and the army, reflecting the essence and content of war, are an instrument in the ideological struggle. They help in the fight against the idealistic world outlook, a metaphysical approach to the phenomena of war, serve as a means for the exposure of the reactionary essence and direction of the military theories and doctrines of modern imperialism. The Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and the army lends Soviet military science a clearly expressed ideological content, elevates it above bourgeois military science. The view of bourgeois military theoreticians that wars are inevitable and eternal prevents them from correctly understanding the laws of war.

No wonder, therefore, that a sharp controversy rages round such concepts as "war", "peace", "aggression", "military conflict", "military power", etc. John F. Kennedy, former US President, said in one of his addresses to the nation that "the Soviets and ourselves give wholly different meanings to the same words: war, peace, democracy and popular will. We have wholly different views of right and wrong, of what is an internal affair and what is aggression. And above all we have wholly different concepts of where the world is and

where it is going."[1] Third the Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and the army is the general theoretical basis of Soviet military science and military doctrine, of the whole aggregate of knowledge on military matters Soviet military science and doctrine can successfully resolve their tasks because they rely on a correct understanding of the essence of wars, their sources, the laws governing their emergence, the political motives and "mechanisms" of their unleashing, etc. The basic propositions of that teaching help to study the question about the relations between military theories, to resolve the problems of Soviet military art. When planning an operation it is essential to take into account not only military, but also the possible political and economic results of that operation. The rapid rate and result of an offensive in a modern war are largely determined by the ability correctly to account for and to utilise political, class, national and other contradictions in the opponent's camp. If, for example, in the course of an operation the main grouping of the enemy's troops has been routed, this may change not only the strategic situation, but also the political situation on the theatre of military operations. It may lead to a split between the allies in aggressive blocs and thus facilitate the action of the troops fighting them and accelerate the rout of the enemy.

The Marxist principles of war are also directly connected with the solution of such important questions of military strategy as the choice of the direction for the main effort, and of the targets for nuclear missile strikes. In fact, the choice of targets will be determined not so much by military-technical as by political considerations.

Fourth the Marxist-Leninist teaching and concepts on war and the army are of great importance to the troops in their practical activity connected with the preparation for a possible war. A scientific view of the war, of the essence and purpose of the army, is essential for improving the principles governing military development in the Soviet Union and in other socialist countries, for maintaining their high fighting efficiency and combat readiness. An understanding of the essence of the revolution in the military sphere is one of the conditions for working out a correct military-technical policy and organising research work in the military field, etc.

[1] *The New York Times*, June 7, 1961 p 16

The Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and the army makes a comprehensive study of the objective and subjective conditions for preparing every socialist country and the entire socialist community for a possible world war, of the conditions making for the steady increase in the defensive capacity of a state (coalition). This purpose is served by an analysis of the military power of the state, its structure and the mechanism used to increase that power. Naturally, account must be taken of changes in the military power of the probable opponent and of the concrete historical conditions of the contemporary epoch. Revealing the basic trends in the changes of the relation between the military power of the states, the Marxist-Leninist teaching demands of the political and military leadership a solution of the main tasks in the existing situation, provides a theoretical basis for the military policy that must be pursued in order to use the material and spiritual forces towards increasing the defensive capacity of the country.

Being part of historical materialism, the Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and the army gives the Soviet people, the people of other socialist countries and all fighters against aggression and war knowledge of how to strengthen the defensive capacity of the country and to raise its military power, imbues them with optimism by showing them the superiority and invincibility of the socialist military organisation. It instils in them faith in the power and success of the socialist armed forces, in the ability of the army and the navy to fulfil their historic mission to the victorious end.

The Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and the army has an important methodological role to play in educating the army and navy personnel, and also the entire population of the USSR and other socialist countries. It helps to make the builders of communist society defenders of its achievements, shows the need for a close interrelation between training and education. Hence, the propositions of the Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and the army must be taken into account by such social sciences as psychology, pedagogics, history, etc.

The Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and the army is an important link in the methodological basis of Soviet military theory. At the same time it helps better to understand the erroneousness of the methodological basis of bourgeois military science and thereby acts as a powerful weapon in the

struggle against it. The anti-scientific nature of the solution of sociological problems of war and the army by bourgeois military theoreticians and ideologists weakens bourgeois military science, makes it inconsistent, eclectic and in definite conditions adventuristic and dogmatic. Bourgeois military science is unable to resolve the vital problems of modern war in a consistently scientific way.

The Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and the army also plays an important methodological role in relation to Soviet military theory because the latter is part of the country's scientific potential, its important indicator. The Marxist teaching on war makes a comprehensive analysis of the relations between military doctrine and military science, shows the specific role they play in the preparation of the army and the country for war, in the course and outcome of the armed struggle.

Soviet military doctrine and Soviet military science are closely interlinked because they rest on a single basis. They rely on the socialist mode of production, on the Soviet social and state system, serve to secure the defensive capacity of the Soviet Union and of the entire socialist community, to raise the combat readiness of the Armed Forces. Soviet military doctrine and military science have the same philosophical, methodological basis—dialectical and historical materialism and the teaching on war and the army. Soviet military doctrine and military science thus fundamentally differ from the doctrines of the capitalist states and from bourgeois military science.

Resting on the same basis, Soviet military doctrine and military science are not only interlinked but also interact with each other. Soviet military doctrine is formulated with the help of military science, relies on its findings. Military science is therefore expressed in practice not only directly, but also through military doctrine. In its turn, military doctrine sets definite tasks to military science, which take the form of state orders, concentrates the efforts of military science on a theoretical solution of the most important questions of military development.

Being relatively independent, Soviet military doctrine and military science fulfil their functions in accordance with their nature and depending on concrete historical conditions, on the requirements of the state policy and its possibilities.

The Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and the army is closely connected with Soviet military doctrine. *This doctrine is a scientifically based and harmonious system of ideas and principles defining the basic tasks of strengthening the country's defensive capacity and military development.* It relies on the Marxist-Leninist analysis of the contemporary epoch and the relation of forces in the world, and also on the prevision of the character of a future war that may be imposed by the imperialists. Soviet military doctrine is called upon to secure the unity of the thought and will of the Soviet soldiers not only through the community of their political ideology, but also through the community of their views on the nature of the military tasks facing them, the ways of their solution and the methods for the combat training of the troops. It is a sound basis for preparing the country's defence. Military doctrine finds its concrete expression in the military policy and also in the field regulations and manuals of the Armed Forces.

The Marxist-Leninist Teaching on War and the Army and Soviet Military Doctrine

Let us review the basic ideas of Soviet military doctrine.

As regards its socio-political nature, the future war, should the imperialists succeed in unleashing it, will be a bitter armed clash between two diametrically opposed social systems, a struggle between two coalitions, the socialist and the imperialist, in which every side will pursue the most decisive aims.

As regards the means used, this war may be a nuclear one. Even though nuclear weapons will play the decisive role in the war, final victory over the aggressor can be achieved only as a result of the joint actions of all the arms of the services, which must utilise in full measure the results of the nuclear strikes at the enemy and fulfil their specific tasks.

As regards its scope the nuclear war will be a world war and an inter-continental one. This is determined both by its socio-political content and by the fact that both sides possess missiles of practically unlimited range, atomic missile-carrying submarines and strategic bombers. The war will engulf practically the entire planet.

It will be waged by methods differing radically from those used in the past. Formerly the direct aim of all military actions was to rout the enemy's forces, without which it was

impossible to reach his vital strategic centres. Now the situation has changed. The use of nuclear missile weapons/ makes it possible to attain decisive military results in a very short time, at any distance and on vast territories. In the event of war not only groupings of the enemy's armed forces will be subjected to destructive nuclear strikes, but also his industrial and political centres, communication centres, everything that feeds the arteries of war.

The first massive nuclear strikes are able largely to predetermine the subsequent course of the war and to inflict such heavy losses in the rear and among the troops that they may place the people and the country in an extraordinarily difficult position.

Nevertheless, troops possessing an adamant will for victory and inspired by the lofty aims of a just war, can and must wage active offensive operations with whatever forces have survived and strive to rout the enemy completely.

Soviet military doctrine proceeds from the assumption that the imperialists are preparing a surprise nuclear attack against the USSR and other socialist countries. At the same time they consider the possibility of waging military operations with conventional weapons and the possibility of these operations escalating into military actions involving the use of nuclear missile weapons. Therefore, the chief and main task of the Armed Forces consists in being constantly ready to repel a sudden attack of the enemy in any form, to foil his criminal intentions, no matter what means he might use.

Thus, the basic propositions of military doctrine play an important role in the development of military affairs. They act as guiding ideas, as it were, in drafting the principles for the preparation of the Armed Forces and the state as a whole for modern war.

Military doctrine is subject to definite changes. That means, that depending on changed conditions the state may either improve the existing doctrine or, if it is outdated, replace it by a new one. For example, after the Great Patriotic War the USSR at first improved the existing doctrine by taking into account the experience gained in the last war. After that, in the early sixties, a new modern doctrine was worked out. It differs qualitatively from the previous doctrine. However, changes are being made in the present doctrine as well, although they do not affect its essence.

As regards its character military doctrine is a link connecting military science with political practice, and through military practice with military art, notably with military strategy.

The Marxist-Leninist Teaching on War and the Army and Soviet Military Science

The Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and the army is indissolubly connected with Soviet military science. Both study and investigate the same object: war and the army, but this unity contains also a distinction. This is because they have different subjects of research.

The Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and the army studies the essence of war and the army, their origin, the laws governing the emergence of war, the development of military power and the armed forces of different states. Soviet military science conducts research into the laws of the armed struggle in their interaction with the laws determining the course and outcome of the war. Common to the Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and the army and Soviet military science is that they both rely on an identical socio-political basis—on the Soviet social and state system. But in this too there is a distinction. The Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and the army had shaped before the emergence of the socialist system and was further developed in conditions of socialist society. Soviet military science formed and developed under the Soviet social and state system utilising some of the prerequisites created in the past.

The unity of the Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and the army and of Soviet military science is determined also by the fact that they have a common ultimate aim—to prepare the country and the army for the waging of victorious wars in defence of the socialist country. Yet, in this too there is a distinction between them. The Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and the army is important first and foremost as a means for the moral and political preparation of the country and the armed forces for the waging of a war in defence of the socialist country. It arms the Soviet people with an understanding of the essence and importance of all wars, notably of just ones, gives a scientific appraisal of the historical role of these wars, works out a correct attitude towards them and secures a moral and political victory over aggressors in just wars. Soviet military science, revealing the character of the war and the laws of the armed struggle, determines the forms

for the organisation of the socialist army and navy and the methods of warfare, and arms the people with the knowledge of the principles and rules for waging a victorious armed struggle in defence of socialism.

It is also important to note that the Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and the army and Soviet military science have common prospects. As distinct from all other sciences and the other components of Marxism-Leninism, which will always continue to develop, Soviet military science and the Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and the army will in future, when wars will have disappeared, wither away as specific fields of knowledge. They will become part of history and will be studied for the same purpose for which we now study the history of the slave-owning or feudal societies. However, so long as war exists they are of vital practical importance.

Developing as relatively independent theories, the Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and Soviet military science interact and enrich each other. As the sociological theory of war, the Marxist-Leninist teaching helped correctly to determine the subject of military science and the range of problems it is to study. The teaching on war and the army made it possible to do away with the far too inclusive interpretation of military science, and also to prevent its role being reduced to the solution of purely military technical problems.

Soviet military science studies the conditions for the preparation and conduct of war depending on politics, socio-economic and other factors, the laws of the armed struggle, and works out the methods and forms of warfare and forms for the organisation of the troops. Military science is the theory of military affairs, the system of knowledge that includes both general theoretical problems of war as a whole, and also the problems of individual operations and actions, the organisation, combat training and military education of the servicemen. All other military subjects are subordinated to the main task—the solution of modern problems linked with the conduct of war in defence of the socialist countries.

As regards its nature military science holds a special place in the system of sciences and in the scientific potential. It holds a special place because it is in a definite manner connected with all other sciences and, at the same time, acts as a specific lever activating the vital elements of the military potential—military equipment, weapons, etc. Military science

is an important factor for strengthening the defensive capacity of the socialist countries. It faces enormous tasks and its responsibility is enormous.

Military science deals with a wide range of questions. It is not confined to the problems that are essential for the solution of the practical tasks connected with the armed forces development at the present moment. Military science also looks into such questions as the probable means and conditions of the conduct of wars being evolved by social development, studies all possible kinds and methods of action and recommends definite ones in keeping with political aims, with the conditions in which these aims are to be achieved, and with the country's possibilities. It takes into account the development of military matters in many countries, combat conditions on different theatres of military operations, etc. Military science studies the laws governing the development of military affairs in all their aspects, and relies also on other sciences and on military doctrine, on the practical experience gained in the military field, and on the initiative of the servicemen, notably the officer corps.

Creative Character of Soviet Military Science and Its Development Tasks in Modern Conditions

An important problem in Soviet military science is the further development of military art in keeping with the radical changes in combat means in the post-war period and the prospects opened up by scientific and technological progress, with due account for experience gained in the Great Patriotic War. Of great importance to a correct solution of that problem is a correct scientific approach, i.e., that adopted by Soviet military science which relies on materialist dialectics, and also on the general propositions of the Marxist-Leninist teaching as a philosophy of war. Being inherently revolutionary and critical, materialist dialectics is an implacable enemy of rut, inertia and dogmatism. It imbues people with the spirit of innovation and creativity. At the same time it stops the researcher from groundless mental speculation, from indulging in fantasies, from a nihilistic attitude towards the achievements of the past. It makes Soviet military science creative and effective.

The revolution in military affairs has changed the character of military science, the character of its development.

Comparatively recently it was typical for military research to rely predominantly on the past, to draw its conclusions from past experience, to reveal regularities, and to trace their action in the present and to forecast it in the immediate future. Now past wars have stopped being the main source for the development of military science. Now it uses modern methods of research and relies on military practice, exercises and games, and attempts to give a deeper analysis of the development trends characteristic of military affairs, to look further ahead, to obtain a clearer view of the future.

To stop the development of military matters means to risk falling behind, to risk being beaten. Marxism-Leninism demands of the Soviet officers that they should not be slaves of the past, that they should see new developments in the situation and have the courage and ability to engage in genuine creativity. Socialist social relations and the changes in military matters open up to military science vast vistas of creative activity that makes military art comply with the changed conditions.

In this respect two erroneous views pose the greatest danger to military science: 1 baseless speculation, which tends to exaggerate the role of this or that new kind of military equipment, of new but not yet tested methods for the solution of military tasks, the experience of small wars, and (2) the making of a fetish of the practical experience of the past, that is, a fear of innovations and a lack of creative search. Both are explained by faults in methodology and the ideological-theoretical foundations.

Stubbornly conservative theories are generally extremely harmful. If they are subscribed to by people who hold positions of great influence in the armed forces, their harm becomes even bigger.

Such leaders, having won victories in former battles, become prisoners of their old experience, make a fetish of it, ignore the new conditions, new equipment, do not make a serious study of it, and fail to notice the possibilities it offers. They lose the ability to foresee the future and, relying on their previous authority and high position, may seriously hamper the victory of the new over the old.

The history of wars and military art shows that in military matters theory often lags behind modern practice. Lloyd George once aptly noted that military leaders generally pre-

pared not for the future, but for the past war. Backward ideas are often much more dangerous than backward weapons.

Let us give a few facts to prove our point.

The machine-gun was invented by the American Hiram Maxim in 1883. But his invention received a very cool reception. Right up to the First World War military thought was unable to realise the upheaval in the methods of warfare the machine-gun would bring about. The same happened when the tank was invented. French military thought, referring to the victory of the Entente over Germany in the First World War, canonised the experience of that war. Even the experience of the offensive mounted by the nazis in Poland in September 1939, when armoured troops were extensively used in combination with aviation, did not teach the French military leaders and theoreticians anything. They were convinced that the Maginot line would make it impossible for the Germans to use manoeuvring methods of warfare. As a result, France lagged behind in the development of armoured troops and in their utilisation in combat.

The history of wars convincingly shows that troops suffer defeat when their actions are based on the erroneous view that the new war, as regards methods, will be a replica of the preceding one. The nazi generals were convinced that the war against the USSR would be a repetition of the war against France, and, applying their Blitzkrieg methods, rushed head over heel into this risky adventure.

One of the essential shortcomings of bourgeois military science, which affected even the most advanced schools and theories, was an ignoring of the importance of economic and moral political factors and an exaggeration of the role of military art, of operational plans.

It should not be thought, however, that these factors were completely ignored. Engels said in his time that every zealous non-commissioned officer understood very well how economic conditions and resources affected victory. Yet, the experience of two world wars shows, that the German High Command was unable to consider the influence of these factors correctly. The German High Command did not ignore these factors, but made a wrong appraisal of their importance, was unable scientifically to determine its own possibilities and those of the opponent. A particularly gross miscalculation was made by the imperialists in the appraisal of the

Soviet Union's strength. The bourgeois theoreticians, politicians and generals were unable to realise the possibilities inherent in socialism.

The creative nature of every genuine science is determined by its indissoluble connection with the practical activity of people. Practice alone makes it possible to determine whether scientific concepts and theories are correct or wrong.

Marxist-Leninist philosophy, however, also opposes making practice a fetish. Practice is in a state of constant movement, constant change and development. Hence, science must opportunely discover and give a theoretical generalisation of everything new emerging during the development of practice. Only this will enable science to pave the way for an advance of practice.

Materialist dialectics obliges us to look forward, not backward. It demands a clear view of the changes in the situation shaping at every historical stage; an understanding of the development trends; the ability to foresee the future, by realising that that future holds much that is unexpected and unusual; an appraisal of what has been achieved from the viewpoint of the future and of the new tasks.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union calls upon the officer corps constantly and deeply to study the problems of military theory and military art in keeping with the demands of modern warfare, effectively to use theory in their practical activity. To do this it is necessary critically to study, analyse and take into account military theory and the combat experience of the imperialist armies, to know military equipment, the weak and strong points of the military science and the art of war of the probable opponent.

3. THE PROBLEM OF THE LAWS OF MILITARY SCIENCE AND THE PRINCIPLES OF MILITARY ART

The Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and the army plays an enormous role in the solution of the highly important general theoretical problem of Soviet military science—the problem of the laws and principles, of the correlation of objective laws and the conscious activity of people. A consistently scientific approach to this question is an important condition for a correct solution of many problems, is the

necessary condition for raising the combat power of the Armed Forces and a factor for the development of applied military knowledge.

For the first time in the history of social thought, the Marxist-Leninist teaching proved that war, like all other social phenomena, is not a chaos of accidents, but a process governed by definite laws.

Revealing the origin and essence of war, the Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and the army makes it possible to gain a correct understanding of the nature of the laws of war and military operations, to understand the mechanism of their operation and to use them for the purpose of strengthening the country's defence and, in case of war, to gain victory over the enemy.

An all-sided analysis of war as a complex socio-political phenomenon is simultaneously an analysis of the laws expressing the dependence of the emergence of wars, and their aims, on economic and political conditions. This is a specific group of laws, making up the basis of the Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and the army, even though they are revealed not only by that teaching, but also by other social sciences, by Marxism-Leninism as a whole. These laws were described at the beginning of the book.

War, as a particular state of society, is characterised by its specific laws, which express the dependence of the course and outcome of wars on the relation of forces—economic, scientific and technical, moral, military—of the warring states or their coalitions, and on the nature of the political aims pursued by the belligerents. This group of laws is studied by the Marxist-Leninist teaching on war, and also by Soviet military science. They form the point of departure, the general theoretical basis of Soviet military science.

This group of laws is closely connected with those governing the development of the methods of warfare and military affairs, which are determined by the development of the productive forces, by scientific and technological progress and the morale of the society. They express the essential links between the development and change in the methods of warfare and the war as a whole. The methods and forms of warfare change in the course of the war and also with the improvement of the armed forces and military matters in peace-time conditions.

Finally, there are the laws acting in the course of the war which express the essence of the armed struggle as a specific of war. They constitute the nucleus of military science, the main element of its content. Their analysis is a province of military science.

The Objective Nature and Relative Independence of the Laws of Armed Struggle

Within the framework of the more general laws governing the development of society and war as a whole, the armed struggle, essentially implying combat operations, is subordinated to its specific laws. This has been repeatedly noted by the founders of Marxism-Leninism. Engels said that once the order has been given military movements on land and at sea are no longer subordinated to the wishes and plans of diplomats, but to their own laws which cannot be interfered with without risking the success of the whole expedition. Lenin, like Marx and Engels, gave much attention to the specific laws of armed uprisings, which are a variant of the armed struggle in general. He wrote that "... armed uprising is *a special* form of political struggle, one subject to special laws..."[1].

The laws of the armed struggle, like all other laws, are objective, that is, they exist and operate independently of the consciousness and will of people.

In their actions the troops cannot be absolutely free, they always depend on definite objective conditions. First, they are compelled to use the equipment, the number of people, the material supplies that are being provided to them by the country, depending on its possibilities, on its economic potential. Second the troops act in keeping with concrete political and military aims, which in their turn causally depend on the economy, social relations and military situation. Third, combat operations are limited in material and spiritual respects by the enemy, for it takes two to wage combat. Fourth, the troops have to consider definite external conditions—area, time, weather, etc. The definite, essential chain of relations—the laws of the armed struggle—which do not depend on the wishes and will of its participants, shapes on the basis of these objective conditions and the purposeful activity pursued by the troops of the warring sides.

[1] V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 179.

The objective laws of the armed struggle do not depend on how deeply and correctly they have been cognised by science and whether they have been correctly understood by people. The laws of the armed struggle cannot be arbitrarily cancelled or abolished. Therefore, the observance of these laws in the control of combat operations is an essential condition for the attainment of victory. Conversely, actions fought contrary to these laws will inevitably lead to defeat in the struggle against a strong and skillful opponent. The objective nature of the laws of the armed struggle, as also of all other laws, is demonstrated particularly vividly when people violate them, and as a result, do not attain their aims but suffer defeat.

The laws of the armed struggle possess features similar to those of all other laws of nature and society. At the same time, however, they differ from them. This difference is conditioned by the fact that war is a specific socio-political phenomenon. The difference is determined directly by two basic factors: the military-political aims pursued by the belligerents, on the one hand, and the relation of material and spiritual forces of the warring sides at every given moment, on the other. The laws of the armed struggle characterise an antagonistic process, a constant competition aimed at destroying the forces of the enemy and preserving its own forces, a process that is constantly changing in different directions both in quantitative and qualitative respects. This is so because the two sides pursue diametrically opposite military-political aims.

Thus, the essence of the laws of the armed struggle is that they express the complex and contradictory nature of a specific socio-political phenomenon, the violent interaction of the warring sides in which each of them strives to attain definite military-political aims. The specific forces, means and aims, for the sake of which the means and forces are applied, express in their aggregate the nature of the laws governing combat operations.

The Type of the Laws of Armed Struggle

The laws of the armed struggle cannot be laid down once and for all as, for example, the laws of mechanics. Like all social laws, they act as a general tendency.

In his preface to *Capital* Marx wrote that his task was to reveal the natural laws of the capitalist mode of production

and that these laws themselves were tendencies working with iron necessity towards inevitable results. Engels noted that economic laws, although they act with "iron necessity", themselves are by no means "iron", but, on the contrary, are very "elastic". For example, the price of every single commodity is not directly equal to its cost. Owing to fluctuations in the supply and demand and other circumstances the prices of commodities fluctuate around their value and, generally, do not coincide with it. The law of value determines the prices of commodities only on an average, in general.

The laws of the armed struggle act in a similar, though not identical, way. They do not belong to the type of dynamic laws, which express the nature of regular processes and are definitive. The movement of the planets in the solar system is an example of such processes, for it is a vividly expressed autonomous process. The laws of the armed struggle cannot be relegated to statistical laws that express irregular, chaotic processes. An example of such processes is the irregular, thermal movement of molecules, typical of which is a great number of accidents. The laws of thermodynamics determine the movement of the aggregate of molecules but not that of every molecule individually, and, therefore, rely on probability.

Regular and chaotic processes are two extreme types of processes, but there is a wide spectrum of processes in between. Besides, chaotic processes often grow over into regular processes, while regular processes may become chaotic. To what type of processes does the armed struggle belong: to orderly or chaotic ones? It belongs both to the one and to the other type. The armed struggle involves processes in which order is being continuously introduced by more general laws, military organisation and system, and also by the guiding and organisational activity of the commanding personnel, from the junior commanders to the Supreme Command. Indeed, military actions are a process in which each of the belligerents spends efforts to preserve unity of will and action, order and organisation in its ranks and to prevent the enemy from doing the same. As a result of mutual strikes, manoeuvring and a number of other circumstances two tendencies emerge and manifest themselves in each of the warring sides one tendency expresses the striving for maximum purposefulness, planning and organisation in its

actions; the other reflects, owing to the enemy strikes and other reasons, a disturbance of order, organisation and planning. Within certain limits the lack of order is also due to the contradictory nature and complexity of military organisms, battle formations, operational dispositions, etc., the complexity of the mental reaction of officers and men to changing situations and other factors. It can therefore be said that the tendency to introduce order into the actions of the troops is constantly counterposed by another tendency—the tendency to disrupt such order. Which of the two tendencies will predominate during the armed struggle depends on many circumstances. A major role is played by the strength of the blows delivered by the enemy, the extent to which the troops are supplied with weapons and equipment, foodstuffs and other combat means, by the firmness and efficiency of the leadership, the character of the terrain, the time of the year and of the day. Of enormous importance are the morale and combat qualities of the servicemen, which depend on the social system, the social nature of the army, the aims of the war, the training and education of the troops in peacetime. The army that maintains a greater organisational stability during combat actions, possesses a higher morale, is more disciplined, more systematic and purposeful in its actions, is more likely to win.

There are also other counteracting tendencies in the armed struggle. While interacting these tendencies form a single tendency, which grows dominant and determines in the main the general direction in which events develop.

Under definite conditions some of these tendencies become particularly important and gain the upper hand over the opposite tendencies, while in other conditions, they may change places. Opposite tendencies always interlink and supplement each other. It is part of a general's skill to combine these tendencies most rationally in a specific situation for the purpose of routing the enemy. Lenin's view that under definite conditions it is both possible and necessary to combine opposites in a way that will produce a symphony and not a cacophony is fully applicable to the conduct of combat operations.

During the Second World War, for example, the tendency to concentrate forces on decisive sectors, or one main sector, in order to prepare a destructive blow was opposed by the

tendency to spread the armed forces along the whole front-line, so as to prevent the appearance of undefended sectors and breakthroughs by the enemy. During the offensives the tendency to spread the troops was due to the striving to seize various objectives having important political, economic or strategic value, objectives very far from each other, and also to induce the enemy to disperse his forces and thereby to deprive him of the possibility of manoeuvring his reserves.

The tendencies towards the concentration and dispersal of forces manifested themselves vividly on the decisive front of the Second World War. Depending on conditions either one or the other acquired a dominant significance. At the beginning of the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union against nazi Germany, when the main forces of the German fascist army had mounted an offensive, the enemy enjoyed a considerable numerical superiority (on the main sectors this superiority was four or five to one). This enabled him to overcome the resistance of the Red Army's forward units on many sectors of the front. The Soviet troops fought in pockets of resistance. The absence of a continuous defence line enabled the enemy's tank and motorised formations to bypass these pockets of resistance and to strike blows at the flanks and rear of the Soviet troops.

These and other circumstances were among the main reasons for the forced retreat of the Soviet troops in the beginning of the war. However, in the course of the war, the Soviet Command took the mistakes committed in the initial period into account and established in accordance with the concrete conditions, the relation of forces and the aim of the campaign, a correct combination between the defence on the vastly extended front and the concentration of forces on its main sectors. This made it possible to thwart the offensive of the enemy's strike groupings and to mount powerful offensive operations aimed at routing the enemy's troops.

The armed struggle involves many contingencies which are due to its extreme complexity and antagonistic contradictoriness, the constant changes in the relation between the opponents' forces, changes in the conditions in which they are fighting, and depend to a great extent on the skill and ability of the troops to use this relation in their favour.

There may be different contingencies. They can be individual, isolated deviations in the actions of some of the soldiers in a large collective, of individual units and sub-units, performance of crews or teams that are above or below the general level, occasional breakdowns in communications or in control, changes in the rates of the advance of troops under enemy counteraction or due to weather conditions, the disablement of commanders, separate elements of battle formations and operational dispositions, etc. These phenomena affect the course of combat and its outcome. But, they may be said to lie on the fringes of necessity, characterise deviations from laws. Contingencies differ from each other as regards their origin, place and importance, act in different directions, and therefore overlap, cancel or supplement, or compensate each other.

In their aggregate contingencies are a form in which necessity manifests itself and they supplement that necessity. The general trend, assumed by the development of the armed struggle, becomes even less dependent on the influence of accidental phenomena and processes.

Thus, the laws of the armed struggle express its complex and contradictory nature and show that the development of operations is the result of many factors. The interaction and overlapping of many deviations, of all sorts of contingencies, create ultimately an order and a form corresponding to the given relation of forces, to the concrete conditions.

Historical Character of the Action and Cognition of the Laws of Armed Struggle

Many bourgeois military theoreticians maintain that the laws of military science are eternal and immutable. Military history proves them wrong, for it shows that these laws are historically conditioned, which can be seen from the fact that some laws emerge while others stop operating. The law that the outcome of the battle is decided by a strike delivered with side-arms was valid for many centuries. It continued to be valid, in one form and another, and to a definite extent, even when bayonet charges were combined with fire, the role of which was constantly increasing. It was only during the Second World War that this law stopped operating and another law took its place—the law on the decisive role of a fire strike, which in modern conditions means, first and foremost, an attack by nuclear weapons.

Furthermore, the fact that the laws of the armed struggle are historically conditioned can be seen from the fact that definite tendencies at one time and in some wars become dominant, while at other times and in other wars they are pushed to the background. The modern revolution in military affairs confirms the above statement forcefully. It does not remove, but intensifies the action of the basic laws governing combat operations, but at the same time, in higher measure than before, weakens some and strengthens other laws, and is responsible for the emergence of new ones. For example, the law of the dependence of combat operations on the superiority in combat power may in a nuclear war be subjected to particularly important changes. The interaction of the opposite tendencies towards concentration and dispersal acquires a qualitatively new content in such a war. A dispersal of troops becomes essential to decrease their loss from enemy nuclear strikes. Yet, the tendency towards the concentration of forces continues to be valid and even acquires a specific character. Therefore, one of the prime principles for the conduct of combat operations in a nuclear war is the principle that Lenin styled as the "law" of military successes—the rapid transition from a heavy concentration of forces and means to their dispersal, and vice versa. The principle of concentrating superior forces on decisive sectors of the front at decisive moments.

Formerly the concentration of forces was expressed in the concentration of enormous masses of troops and equipment on relatively small sectors of the front. This was particularly vividly expressed during the Second World War. In a nuclear war the concentration will mean, first and foremost, massive nuclear strikes against the main sectors, which probably will be effected not by concentrating missile launchers on narrow sectors, but by manoeuvring missile trajectories from the depth and the flanks.

One of the conditions determining the character of the cognition of these laws is contained in the historicity of their actions. But this is only one condition and by no means the decisive one. The development of military knowledge has shown that the elucidation of the laws governing combat operations has travelled a long, complex and contradictory path. The simple empirical explanation, the description of the causes of victory and defeats, in which the objective laws

were only guessed, and sometimes distorted, was followed by their reflection in the light of the principles of bourgeois military science and finally by the formulation of these laws by Soviet military science—such, in short, is the road taken by the cognition of the laws of war, of the laws of combat.

In the most general form there are two levels of cognition of laws—the empirical and the theoretical. In its turn, the theoretical level of reflection can be scientific or unscientific. For this there are many reasons, both gnosiological and social. The most important reasons are that scientific knowledge as a whole, and military knowledge in particular, develop in a very general way, that they are determined by the maturity and the scientific level of the philosophical, methodological basis for the cognition of laws, by the social, class positions of military theoreticians and functionaries, by the fact that military knowledge is conditioned by class, political considerations, etc.

The emergence in the historical arena of the proletariat and its philosophy—dialectical materialism, which scientifically explained the motive forces of historical development, and the establishment in Russia of socialist social relations, made possible the development of a genuine military science, and a correct understanding of the laws of combat operations and the war as a whole.

The laws of Soviet military science more or less accurately reflect the objective laws actually existing in the armed struggle. When they are cognised by science, the laws of the armed struggle become a basis for the practical activity of people, for strategic, operational and tactical leadership. These are laws on the basis of which commanders make decisions, draft plans for imminent battles and operations, organise the troops for the implementation of these plans in the interests of victory.

The laws of military science are linked with each other not in a haphazard, but in a very definite manner. In aggregate they form a system that reflects most adequately the real links and relations between combat operations, the armed struggle as a whole. Definite successes have been scored in working out a sufficiently complete and comprehensive system of the laws of military science This work has not yet been completed.

No matter what system we use to classify the laws of Soviet military science, the decisive role is played by two of them: the law of the dependence of the war on politics and the law of the correspondence of the course and the outcome of the war to the relation of the belligerents' forces. The action of these laws embraces all the processes of war at all its levels and scales.

While the course and outcome of a war between states depends first and foremost on the correlation of their military power, on the ability of their political and military leadership to create a superiority of forces and to use it in its favour, every concrete act of war—combat, operation or battle—is also conditioned by its concrete relation of forces, by its concrete aims.

At the same time the law of the relation of forces can be regarded also from a somewhat different angle. Because of its general nature it includes a number of tendencies, a number of relatively independent relations, which because of their importance can be considered laws in themselves. In Soviet military writings they are called the laws of the course and outcome of war. They govern the dependence of the course and outcome of the war on the relation of the military, economic, scientific and moral-political forces of the belligerents.

The laws defining the effectiveness of combat operations hold a special place in the system comprising the laws of military science. They are organically linked with the laws looked into above and are to a high degree conditioned by them. The most important law of the armed struggle, which determines not only the emergence of new methods of warfare, but also the victory and defeat of troops, was formulated by Frederick Engels. It states that victory or defeat depends on the quantity and the quality of the population and on the equipment. In the final analysis it is the people and the equipment that secure the superiority in forces that is necessary for the victory over the enemy.

The operation of this law can be clearly seen also in our time. The fact that several armies have been equipped with nuclear missile weapons has necessitated a revision of the methods of warfare and made the success of operations directly dependent on whether the armed forces are equipped with modern, notably nuclear missile weapons, and whether

they know how to use them, whether they are prepared to repel an enemy using such weapons in material and also in moral and psychological respects.

The laws defining the effectiveness of the action of troops on the battlefield include a number of tendencies, the action of which secures a build-up of forces and creates the most favourable conditions for successful fighting. For example, the effectiveness of the combat operations of troops depends on the correspondence of the applied methods and forms to the aims (tasks) pursued and to the prevailing situation. Obviously, such a correspondence is essential for the success of combat operations in modern war, in which rapid and sudden situational changes will be the rule rather than the exception.

That law is closely linked with the law according to which the success of combat action requires that the aims (combat tasks) and the applied forces and means should be in a definite ratio to the forces and means of the enemy, and also that the space and time factors should be strictly taken into account. Such a balancing is extremely important when mass destruction weapons are used. A violation of this demand will have dangerous consequences, while its correct application leads to victory.

Thus, in 1941-1942 the nazi troops were set a task that greatly exceeded their real possibilities. When they encountered the stiff resistance of the Soviet Army, the German troops suffered huge losses, while their reserves were being quickly exhausted. Having failed to attain their strategic aims, they found themselves in an extremely difficult position. The Soviet High Command took that into account when it prepared and mounted the counteroffensive near Moscow, and in the next year—at Stalingrad, having first amassed the necessary means and forces to ensure its success.

Furthermore, the effectiveness of the actions of troops depends on the nature, strength and direction of the strikes delivered by them. These strikes are a concentrated expression of the material and spiritual strength of the troops, of their training and experience, and also of the art of their commanders. The preparation of the troops, their co-operation, the manoeuvring of forces and means, the operational disposition and battle formation—all this ultimately serves to deliver the most powerful blows to the enemy and to safeguard one's own troops against his blows.

Military science also includes some laws that express essential and necessary links and relations within the various services and arms, during the employment of military equipment, weapons, etc. These are specific laws, studied as concrete military-technical subjects.

Naturally the laws we have considered above are only part of those making up the system of the laws of military science. That system is much fuller and richer and what we have shown here is but a vague outline.

Mechanism of Action and Utilisation of the Laws of Armed Struggle

The existence of objective laws of the armed struggle does not belittle the active role played by conscious leadership of the combat operations of troops, but on the contrary, secures the possibility of such leadership and of its fruitfulness. The knowledge of the laws of the armed struggle, their study by Soviet military cadres and their observance in the drafting of plans for combat operations are an earnest of sure victory over the enemy.

A knowledge of these laws stops false and arbitrary actions, prevents adventurism, makes it possible to foresee the course of military events, opportunely to take measures forestalling enemy action, prevents an adaptation to spontaneously shaping situations, a fetishisation of accidents; makes it possible to adopt courageous decisions, to advance clear and big aims, to control the course of the armed struggle and to impose one's will on the enemy.

The objective laws of the armed struggle must not be regarded as laws of fate that dominate people and condemn them to inaction; they do not act automatically, by themselves, do not ignore people, do not operate without their active participation. They are, and this must be remembered, *laws of the combat activity of the belligerent troops.*

The commanders in the army and navy are obliged, once they have learned the objective laws of the armed struggle, to learn how to apply them consciously.

To do this it is necessary, first of all, to distinguish between the knowledge of the laws and their active application. For example, one takes the law of gravity into account, so as not to fall while walking. It is quite a different matter, however, to use this law in artillery, rocketry or aeronautics. The latter is a higher stage in the mastery of the law, one

that requires for people to carry out a number of necessary conditions. Second, we must keep in mind that the application of law can be empirical, practical, but can also be scientific. In the latter event the utilisation of the laws of the armed struggle makes it possible to assess one's actions more correctly and more comprehensively, to prevent possible enemy actions, rationally to utilise one's forces and means, etc.

A conscious utilisation of the laws of the armed struggle for the sake of victory presupposes the application of known laws and the search for new ones. The effective utilisation of these laws depends on the correctness and depth of: (a) the knowledge of the essence of the laws; b the knowledge of the mechanism of their action and (c) the knowledge of the mechanism for the utilisation of the laws. The mechanism of the action of the laws is objective and does not depend on the will and consciousness of people, while the mechanism of their utilisation is linked with the subjective activity of people, especially of the commanders. This is a conscious, purposive activity of the military personnel.

The mechanism of the action of the laws expresses the essence of the concrete relations shaping in the course of the armed struggle, i.e., its nature. Thus, it includes the activity of large masses of people, united in military organisms and led by the command. Definite methods and forms by which the troops implement set aims, using material and spiritual forces for that purpose, are links of that mechanism. Here two cases are possible. The links of that mechanism may have an identical socio-political nature for both belligerents or they can be directly opposed as is the case, for example, in combat operations waged during wars in defence of the socialist countries. The different class nature of the armed forces determines also the extent to which spontaneity is manifested in the action of the laws of armed struggle. All this shows that the mechanism of the action of those laws includes contradictory tendencies, a struggle of action and counteracting factors, an important place among which is held by the activity of commanders.

The activities of the troops proceed on the basis of objectively operating laws. The action of these laws is not simple, it is many-faceted. These laws form the basis for the extensive creativity of the troops, of the command, in the

solution of more general combat tasks in different conditions and in dependence on the situation. Therefore, the utilisation of the laws is expressed also by the subjective activity of people, which has both quantitative and qualitative aspects. These aspects tell on the appraisal of the situation, the study of the enemy, of one's own troops, of the tasks set by the senior command, etc.

The links of the mechanism for the utilisation of the laws are: the drawing up of plans, the decision to give combat, to launch an operation or battle, all sorts of requisite calculations; the definition for the ways to achieve victory, the selection of the forms and methods of operation; the preparation of the troops for combat in moral and political respects, making sure that every soldier understands his duties and knows how to fulfil them; a well-organised system of communications and control, the organisation of troops cooperation and some other elements.

Principles of Military Art

The principles of military art play a specific role in the understanding of the laws and of the mechanism of their application. Even though the difference between the laws of military science and the principles of military art is great it must not be overstated. A law of the science establishes the existence of a definite relation, but it does not define any of the tasks involved in the practical activity of the troops. *The principles, on the other hand, determine the direction taken by the activity of the troops, of the political and military leadership, and show what action should be taken to gain victory.* This makes the principles a necessary link in the mechanism of the cognition and utilisation of laws. They make it possible to translate scientific formulas, the content of the laws, into the language of practical activity, of military practice. For example, the law stipulating that victory will be gained by the side concentrating superior forces and means at the decisive place and the decisive moment, finds its expression in the principle of the massing of forces: to secure success in battles and operations it is essential to concentrate forces and means at key sectors and at the correct time, superior to the forces and means of the enemy. In other words, there is not and cannot be a chasm between the laws of military science and the principles of military art.

The principles of military art may be correct, may be wrong or partly wrong. In their working out a major role is assigned to social conditions, to the nature of the methodology used, to the level of cadre training and other factors; therefore, the number of the principles of military art and their content differed in different countries and at different times. For example, at present the US field regulations include 10 principles, the British—9. Much has been said about the immutability of these principles and equally much about their excessive mobility. Soviet military science enjoys much more favourable conditions for a comprehensive cognition of the laws of military science and for the elaboration of the principles of military art.

The principles of the art of war form in their aggregate a system that determines in the most general form the activity of the military personnel in the training of troops and the waging of combat actions. The system of the principles of military art is a component part of Soviet military science.

The principles governing the conduct of combat operations are essentially common to combat operations of a strategic, operational and tactical character, since they show the practical utilisation of identical laws. At the same time, however, the principles of strategy, operational art and tactics differ as regards their scale of action and aims pursued, and, hence, as regards their concrete content, the concrete expression of general requirements.

The system of the principles of Soviet military art finds its concrete expression and is expounded in detail in the corresponding regulations and manuals. It reflects the demands of the laws of military science as applying to the tasks being implemented by the troops in modern conditions. For example, important principles are the principle of cooperation, the principle of suddenness and others.

It should be noted that the principles can be used only for guidance. Their application demands of every commander great skill and a live, creative attitude to his job, as well as an understanding that the principles of military art are embodied in plans and decisions, and in the actions of the troops.

The drawing up of plans is a creative process, one that must produce something new and original, something that

is not available in a ready state in reality, requires an original solution of the questions that have been placed on the agenda by life itself, and the finding of the most expedient means for an application of the available forces. As a rule it is rare that combat operations conform to preliminary plans accurately. Therefore these plans must be amended and supplemented, and sometimes revised or even replaced, if this is required by the changing situation. But even if the plan for the given combat or operation remains in force, the commanders must take independent decisions, show initiative and creativity within the framework of the set tasks.

Hence, *the objective laws of the armed struggle and its conduct according to plan are two indissolubly linked aspects of a single process.* Purposefulness and conformity to plan secure the unity of will and action of the troops, the consistency of these actions in time, the adamance in the struggle for the achievement of set aims, the application of the most varied forms of struggle and their rapid change, if necessary. Purposefulness and conformity to plan secure particularly active offensive action. Big aims assigned to the offensive inspire the troops. Naturally, such results can be attained only if the aims and the plans do not run counter to the demands of the objective laws of the armed struggle, but fully comply with them.

An interpretation of the laws and principles of military science from positions of dialectical materialism and the Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and the army is of enormous importance to the activity of the military personnel. This is due, first to the fact that in modern conditions, in connection with a revolution in military affairs, it is essential to master principles of warfare which have so far been worked out only theoretically and do not as yet rely on practical military experience. The power of scientific previsions must compensate for the absence of practice in the conduct of combat operations with modern weapons. Second, without a deep-going theoretical elaboration of the laws of military science and the principles of military art it is impossible to improve troop control, to raise its scientific level. The laws serve as the basis for the purposive activity of people, as the basis for the effective control over all processes, including the armed struggle. Third, only by a creative attitude to military theory in general, and to its nucleus—

the laws and principles—in particular, is it possible to develop it further and to improve it. Fourth, a creative attitude to the cognition and application of the laws of military theory and the principles of military art presupposes an increase in the activity of all soldiers in the development of military affairs, military theory, a deep study of field regulations and manuals, which reflect the main propositions of military theory, and give practical recommendations.

The further development of military theory and practice, a deep understanding of everything that was borne out by the revolution in military affairs and by the socio-political changes in the world, are an important duty of the military cadres of the socialist countries.

* * *

CONCLUSION

The Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and the army has stood for more than half a century the historical test of the construction of socialism and communism in the USSR, it has proved its worth by the victorious outcome of the war in defence of the first socialist state in the world, and its correctness has been confirmed by the experience of the development of the world socialist system, the strengthening of the military co-operation of the fraternal countries. In modern conditions the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has raised this teaching to a new, higher stage. It has worked out the most important problems of war and the army, which are of enormous importance in defining and implementing military policy and military development, as proceeding from the specific features of the contemporary epoch and the possibility of a world war.

An analysis of the fundamental problems of the Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and the army makes it possible to draw certain conclusions, namely:

1) Decisive for a deep and correct understanding of the attitude of the Marxist-Leninist Parties to war is a study of the nature of modern wars, their specifics and their sources. Marxism-Leninism, as an integral and harmonious system of philosophical, economical and socio-political views, provides the only scientific solution of these questions. It defines the attitude of the Communist and Workers' Parties to modern

wars of different types from the position of proletarian internationalism. Resolutely opposing imperialist, annexionist wars, including wars between capitalist states and local wars, aimed at suppressing national-liberation movement, the Communist Party and the whole Soviet people consider it their duty to support the noble struggle of the oppressed peoples and just, liberation wars against imperialism.

(2.) The strengthening of the defensive capacity of the USSR and the whole socialist community is linked with the correct understanding of the content of the contemporary epoch, the laws and trends of its development. The 24th Congress of the CPSU noted that the relation of forces in the world today continues to change in favour of socialism, the working-class and national liberation movement. At the same time it should be taken into account that at present imperialist aggression is intensified and reactionary forces are becoming more active. The deepening of the general crisis of capitalism and the exacerbation of its contradictions intensify the adventurism of imperialism, its danger to the cause of peace and social progress. Predatory US imperialism is the main source of war threat today. This conclusion of the Communist Party is of enormous theoretical and practical value. It helps us to see the real possibilities for preventing a world nuclear war and at the same time shows that there is a real possibility of it being unleashed by aggressive imperialist forces.

(3.) The fundamental propositions of the Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and the army are constantly developed by the Communist Party and serve as the scientific and theoretical basis for the solution of concrete questions pertaining to raising the military might of the USSR and the entire socialist camp, are a manual for action in their struggle against the war danger, for general peace.

(4.) The Communist Party of the Soviet Union sees to it that the defensive might of the USSR, the combat readiness of its armed forces be maintained at a level securing the decisive and complete rout of any enemy who would dare to encroach upon the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Armed Forces, equipped with the latest military equipment and weapons, are a mighty factor in the maintenance of universal peace. In case of war they are able to deliver a destructive blow on the enemy and to rout him completely.

The significance of the Soviet Union's military power and the role of the CPSU in its creation are valued highly by all progressive forces throughout the world.

The Armed Forces of the USSR and other socialist countries are resolving major international tasks. The armies of all socialist countries steadily increase their combat power. The servicemen of these armies are constantly strengthening combat co-operation, are being educated in the spirit of faithfulness to their internationalist duty, of intolerance towards national and racial enmity, in the spirit of intolerance to the enemies of communism, peace and the freedom of the peoples. The ideological and political, economic and military unity of the socialist community is the basis of its invincibility.

5. The Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and the army is the philosophical and sociological basis of modern Soviet military doctrine and military science. It makes it possible correctly, from scientific, Party positions to approach the solution of all military problems in the light of the revolutionary changes in the military field. The working out of specific questions of the armed struggle and the preparations for it are the main content of military science and practice. It should, however, be remembered that war is the continuation of politics by violent means, while military affairs depend on the development of the economy, science, on the socio-political system, ideology, morale and cultural level of the population. In resolving its tasks Soviet military science proceeds from a deep-going and comprehensive analysis, an objective evaluation of the economic, scientific, technical and moral-political possibilities of the countries in the socialist community and in the imperialist camp, takes into account the fact that in modern war politics have become even more important.

There is not a single question in the solution of the problems in the military field, the problems of war, that is not being distorted at present by the bourgeoisie, by the Right and "Left" revisionists. The Party content and scientific nature of Soviet military theory is a sharp and reliable weapon in the modern ideological struggle, in the struggle for peace.

CHRONOLOGY OF WARS, ARMED UPRISINGS AND MILITARY CONFLICTS

(from the end of the 19th century)

April 21-August 12, 1898	Spanish-American War—the first imperialist war for a redivision of the world Seizure by the USA of Spanish colonies
1898	Suppression by British troops of the powerful popular uprising in the Sudan (began in 1881)
February 1899-April 1901	Imperialist war of the USA against the Philippine Republic
1899-1901	Colonial war by France against tribes living in the Northwestern Sahara and final conquest of the whole Sahara
1899-1901	Gee Ho Chuan anti-imperialist uprising in China and its suppression by the troops of Germany Britain the USA, France, Japan tsarist Russia Austro-Hungary and Italy
1899-1902	Occupation of Cuba by US troops
October 12, 1899 to May 31, 1902	Anglo-Boer War Transformation of the Orange Free State and the Republic of Transvaal into British colonies
1901, 1902, 1903	US Armed intervention in Colombia
1903	Seizure by the USA of the Panama Canal zone
1904-1907	Uprising of the Herero and Hottentot tribes against the German colonialists in Southwest Africa
1904	British armed intervention in Tibet

January 26 1904-August 23, 1905	Russo-Japanese War
1905-1907	First Russian Revolution (June 14-June 24, 1905—mutiny on the Battleship *Potemkin*; June 22-24—workers' uprising in Lodz, October 26-28—uprising in Kronstadt; November 11-16—uprising in Sevastopol· December 1905—workers' uprising in Moscow and some other cities July 17-20, 1906—sailors' mutiny in Sveaborg and Kronstadt)
1905-1911	Bourgeois revolution in Iran (its culmination—the uprising in Tabriz). Intervention by British and tsarist Russian troops
1905	US armed intervention in Honduras
1906-1909	Uprising in Cuba and her occupation by US troops
1906-1911	Popular uprisings in China
1907	Peasant uprising in Rumania
June 1, 1907	Peasant uprising in the Punjab (India)
1907	US armed intervention in Honduras
1907	Anti-Japanese uprising in Korea
July 1908	Uprising in Macedonia and victory of the bourgeois revolution in Turkey (The Young Turk Revolution)
1908	Popular uprising in Guinea against the French colonialists
July 26-31, 1909	Workers' uprising in Barcelona (Spain)
1909	US armed intervention in Nicaragua
1909-1911	Colonial war by French imperialism against the people of Morocco
1910-1912	Mutinies in the Brazilian navy
1910-1912	Mass uprisings in Albania against the Turkish yoke
1910-1917	Bourgeois-democratic revolution and civil war in Mexico Failure of US armed interventions in 1914 and 1916-1917
October 4-5, 1910	Uprising and overthrow of the monarchy in Portugal
September 29, 1911-October 18, 1912	Italo-Turkish war and seizure of Tripolitania and Cyrenaica by Italy
October 10, 1911	U Chang uprising, beginning of the Hsinhai bourgeois revolution in China
1912	Mutiny of army sappers near Tashkent

1912	US armed intervention in Honduras
October 9 1912- May 30, 1913	First Balkan war between Turkey and the Balkan Union (Bulgaria, Serbia, Greece and Montenegro)
1912-1915	Armed struggle of the peasants and agricultural workers for land in Brazil
June 29-August 10, 1913	Second Balkan war (Bulgaria against Serbia, Montenegro, Greece, Rumania and Turkey)
August 1, 1914- November 11, 1918	First World War
1915	US armed intervention in Haiti
1915	US armed intervention in Liberia
April 24-30, 1916	Uprising in Dublin, Ireland, against British rule
April 1916	Uprising in the Dominican Republic, suppressed by US troops, and occupation of her territory (up to 1924)
July 1916- February 1917	National liberation uprisings in Central Asia and Kazakhstan
February 27, 1917	Armed uprising in Petrograd and victory of the February bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia
August 3, 1917	Mutiny in the German navy
August 29-September 2, 1917	Workers' uprising in Torino (Italy)
1917-1920	Great October Socialist Revolution. Civil war and foreign military intervention in Russia
1917-1922	Uprising in Cuba and US intervention
January 28-May 5, 1918	Workers' revolution in Finland, suppressed by the Finnish bourgeoisie with the assistance of German troops
February 1-2, 1918	Mutiny of the sailors of the Austro-Hungarian squadron in the port of Kattaro
March 1918	Anti-British uprising in Iraq
August-September 1918	"Rice riots" in Japan
September 1918	Vladai mutiny of the soldiers in Bulgaria
October 30-31, 1918	Uprising in Budapest and victory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Hungary
1918-1920	Uprising in Haiti, suppressed by US troops

November 1918	General strike and battle on the barricades in the streets of Rio de Janeiro
1918	Bourgeois-democratic revolution in Germany (November 3—uprising in Kiel; November 5—seizure by workers and sailors of Lübeck, Hamburg and Bremen; November 9—revolution in Berlin)
1919	Revolutionary uprisings of the proletariat in Germany (January 5-13—workers' uprising in Berlin; January 10-February 3—Bremen Soviet Republic; March 3-16—uprising in Berlin; April 13-May 1—Bavarian Soviet Republic)
March-April 1919	Popular uprising in Egypt against the British invaders
March-April 1919	Popular uprising in Korea against the Japanese invaders
April 1919	Massacre by British troops of a demonstration in Amritsar. Uprising in Punjab (India)
April 16-27, 1919	Mutiny on the ships of the French squadron in the Black Sea
April 18-August 1, 1919	Armed struggle of the Hungarian Soviet Republic against the troops of the Entente and internal counter-revolutionaries
1919-1921	Guerilla war in Ireland against British rule
May 3-June 3, 1919	Anglo-Afghan war and winning of independence by Afghanistan
May 1919-1922	Liberation war of the Turkish people against Anglo-Greek intervention
March 15-23, 1920	Workers' uprising in the Ruhr
April 1920	National-democratic uprising in Tabriz (Iran)
June-August 1920	Popular anti-Italian uprising in Vlorë (Albania)
June-November 1920	Anti-British uprising in Iraq
1920-1921	Suppression by the Red Army of anti-Soviet kulak-Socialist-Revolutionary mutiny in the Tambov Gubernia (Antonov gangs)
February 28-March 18, 1921	Counter-revolutionary mutiny in Kronstadt and its suppression by the Red Army

March-July 1921	Rout of Chinese militarists and Russian whiteguards in Mongolia by the Red Army in conjunction with Mongolian units
March 23-31, 1921	Proletarian uprising in Middle Germany
July 1921	Rout of Spanish interventionists by the Rifian people and formation of the independent Rifian Republic in Morocco
August 1921	Peasant uprising on the Malabar coast in India
October 1921-February 1922	White Finn intervention in Karelia
November 1921	General strike and battles on barricades in Bombay (India)
December 1921	Uprising in Egypt against the British colonialists
February 4, 1922	Anti-British uprising in Chauri Chaura (India)
June 28, 1922-April 30, 1923	Civil war in Ireland
July 5, 1922	Mutiny of the garrison in Rio de Janeiro
October 1922	Expulsion of Japanese interventionists from the Soviet Pacific Coast
1922-1932	Colonial war by Italy against Lybian tribes
August 31-September 27, 1923	Bombardment and occupation of the Greek Island of Corfu by Italian troops
September 19-29, 1923	Anti-fascist popular uprising in Bulgaria
October 23-25, 1923	Workers' uprising in Hamburg
November 6-8, 1923	Workers' uprising in Cracow (Poland)
June 1924	Popular uprising and bourgeois-democratic revolution in Albania
1924-1927	Mutiny in the garrison of São Paulo and revolutionary march of the "Prestes Column" (Brazil)
1924-1927	First revolutionary civil war in China
1925-1926	Colonial war by French and Spanish imperialists in Morocco against the Rifian Republic
1925-1927	National liberation uprising in Syria against the French colonialists
1926-1927	Anti-imperialist uprising in Java (1926) and Sumatra (1927)
1927-1937	Second revolutionary civil war in China
1927	National liberation war in Nicaragua
1928 and 1930	Uprisings of Indian peasants in Bolivia

May 1-3 1929	Massacre of May 1 demonstration in Berlin and battle on the barricades by the Berlin proletariat
July-November 1929	Conflict on the Chinese Eastern railway provoked by the imperialists. Rout by the Red Army of the Chinese militarists
1929	Uprising in Haiti, suppressed by US marines
February 1930	Popular uprising in Indochina against the French colonialists
April-May 1930	Uprising against the British colonialists in the towns of Chittagong Peshawar, Sholapur (India)
1930-1932	Anti-imperialist and anti-feudal uprising in Burma
1931-1933	Anti-feudal uprisings in the princedom of Jammu and Kashmir, Alwar, Dir and Pulra (India)
September 1931-1933	Seizure of Manchuria by the Japanese imperialists
1931-1932	Uprising of the workers and peasants in Peru, revolutionary movement in the army and navy
1932-1933	Peasant uprising in Poland
1932	Uprising in Salvador
1932-1934	War between Colombia and Peru
1932-1935	War between Bolivia and Paraguay
1933	Guerilla war in Cuba
February 1934	Armed struggle of the Austrian proletariat against government troops
March-May 1934	War between the Yemen and Saudi Arabia, provoked by Britain
October 1934	Anti-fascist workers' uprising in Asturias, Catalonia, Madrid and other districts of Spain
May 1935	Uprising on the Philippine Islands
August 14, 1935	Uprising in Fier (Albania) against the Zogu clique
October 3, 1935-May 1936	Italo-Ethiopian war. Ethiopia becomes an Italian colony
November 1935	Popular uprisings in Rio de Janeiro, Niteroi, Recife and Natal (Brazil)
July 1936-March 1939	National revolutionary war of the Spanish people against the fascist rebels and German-Italian interventionists
July 7, 1937-September 2, 1942	National liberation war of the Chinese people against the Japanese invaders

March 11-12, 1938	Seizure of Austria by nazi Germany
July 29-August 11, 1938	Rout by the Red Army of the Japanese invaders near the Khasan Lake
October 1938-March 1939	Seizure of Czechoslovakia by nazi Germany
April 1939	Seizure of Albania by fascist Italy
May 11-August 31, 1939	Invasion by Japanese troops of the territory of the Mongolian People's Republic, near the Khalkhin-Gol River, their rout by the Red Army and the Mongolian troops
September 1, 1939-September 2, 1945	Second World War
November 30, 1939-March 13, 1940	Soviet-Finnish War
June 22, 1941-May 9, 1945	Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union
July 7, 1941	Beginning of the national uprising in Yugoslavia against the fascist invaders
August 1-October 2, 1944	Anti-Hitler uprising in Warsaw
August 19-25, 1944	People's uprising in Paris and liberation of the city from the German fascist invaders
August 27-October 1944	Popular anti-fascist uprising in Slovakia
August 23, 1944	Popular anti-fascist uprising in Bucharest
September 9, 1944	Popular anti-fascist uprising in Bulgaria
October 20, 1944	Uprising in Guatemala
March 27, 1945	Popular uprising in Burma against the Japanese invaders
April 1945	People's liberation uprising in Northern Italy
May 5-9, 1945	Popular anti-fascist uprising in Prague
August 19, 1945	General uprising and victory of the August revolution in Vietnam
October 12, 1945	Popular uprising and proclamation of the independence of Laos
1945-1949	Liberation war of the Indonesian peoples against the Anglo-Dutch colonialists
1946-1954	Liberation war of Vietnam against the French colonialists
January-February 1946	Anti-British uprising in the Indian navy supported by mass actions of the working people

1946-1949	Third revolutionary civil war in China
July 1946-October 1949	Civil war in Greece
September-October 1946	Uprising in South Korea against US imperialism
December 1946	Suppression by Iranian government troops of the democratic movement in the Iranian Azerbaijan, Gilyan and Kurdistan
February 28, 1947	Popular uprising on Taiwan against the Kuomintang clique
March-October 1947	Uprising in Paraguay suppressed with the assistance of the US imperialists
March 1947	Popular uprising against the French colonialists on the island of Madagascar
October 1947-December 1948	Indian-Pakistani military conflict over Kashmir
1948	Uprising of the Indian peasants in Bolivia
1948-1949	Arab-Israeli war
March-December 1948	Civil war and intervention by US mercenaries in Costa Rica
April 1948	Popular uprising in Colombia
June 1948-December 1955	Liberation war of the Malayan people against the British colonialists
1949-1950	British aggression against the Yemen
1949-1953	Armed national liberation struggle in the Philippines
June 25, 1950-July 27, 1953	Liberation war of the Korean people against the US interventionists and Korean reactionaries
June 1950	Occupation of Taiwan by US troops
October 1950	Uprising in Puerto Rico suppressed by US troops
1950, 1951, 1953	Uprisings in Peru
January 1952-June 1958	Armed struggle of the Tunisian people against the French colonialists
March 1952	Military coup in Cuba organised with the support of the USA and establishment of Batista's dictatorial regime
April 9-12, 1952	Uprising in Bolivia against the military dictatorship
July 23, 1952	Revolutionary coup and overthrow of the monarchy in Egypt (July 1952 revolution)
July 26, 1952	Revolutionary uprising in Cuba against

	Batista's dictatorial regime
1952-1956	Colonial war of the British imperialists against the national-liberation movement of the Kenyan people
September-December 1952	Operations of the Burmese troops against the Kuomintang troops in Burma
October 1953	Aggression of the British troops in Kuwait
June 1954	Armed intervention of the US mercenaries in Guatemala
November 1, 1954-March 19, 1962	Liberation war of the Algerian people against the French colonialists
1954-1956	Uprisings in Morocco against the French colonialists
January 1955	Aggression of the US mercenaries against Costa Rica
January 1955	Uprising in Guatemala
March-June 1955	Armed struggle in South Vietnam
May 1955	Peasant uprising in Colombia
May 1955	Aggression of British troops in Saudi Arabia
June 1955	Beginning of the liberation war of the people of Oman against the British colonialists
1955-1958	Armed struggle of the population of Cyprus against the British colonialists
February 1956	Uprising in Peru against the dictatorial regime
August 1956	Uprising in Honduras against the dictatorial regime
October-November 1956	Counter-revolutionary uprising in Hungary
1956	Armed struggle of the Cameroon people against the French colonialists
October 29-November 8, 1956	Anglo-Franco-Israeli aggression against Egypt
November 1956	Major popular uprising in Iraq
November 1956	Uprising in Kuwait against British rule
December 1956-January 1959	Civil war in Cuba and victory of the national liberation revolution
December 1956	British aggression in the Yemen
May 1957	Overthrow of the dictatorial regime in Colombia
January 1958	Uprising in Venezuela
1958	Suppression by Indonesian government troops of the armed rebellions organised

	by foreign imperialists and domestic reactionaries
March 1958	Popular uprising in Nyasaland suppressed by British troops
May 1958	General anti-imperialist uprising in the Lebanon
July 14, 1958	National revolution in Iraq
July 1958	Armed intervention by US troops in the Lebanon and by British troops in Jordan
January 1959	Popular uprising in the Congo suppressed by Belgian troops
May 1959-May 1962	Civil war in Laos
August 1959	Uprising in Nicaragua against the dictatorial regime
November 1959-November 22, 1962	Border conflicts and military clash (1962) between India and China
December 1959-1960	Uprising and armed struggle in Paraguay against the dictatorial regime
September 1960-July 1961	Reactionary military coup and civil war in the Congo (Leopoldville)
November 13, 1960	Uprising in Guatemala
February 1961	Beginning of the armed struggle of the Angola insurgents against the Portuguese colonialists
April 17-19, 1961	Aggression of US mercenaries against Cuba and their rout on Playa Giron
July 19-22, 1961	Aggression of French troops in Bizerte (Tunisia)
December 18-20 1961	Liberation by Indian troops of Goa, Daman and Diu from the Portuguese colonialists
1961	Beginning of guerilla struggle in South Vietnam against the reactionary regime and US interventionists
May-June 1962	Uprising of the garrisons in the port of Carradiano and the naval base in Puerto Cabello (Venezuela)
May-August 1962	Military operations in West Irian against the Dutch colonialists for its reunion with Indonesia
September 18-23, 1962	Armed clash between two military groupings in Argentina
September 26-27, 1962	Military coup and overthrow of the monarchy in the Yemen
October 1962-September 1963	Military defence of the Yemen Arab Republic against the attack of Saudi

	Arabian, Jordanian and the British interventionists
December 1962	Armed clash between Congo government (Leopoldville) troops and Tshombe's gendarmerie
January 13 1963	Military coup in the Togo Republic
February 8, 1963	Anti-democratic military coup in Iraq
June 11, 1963-February 10, 1964	Military operations of Iraqi troops against the Kurds who fought for national autonomy
July 21, 1963	Heavy fighting between government troops and opponents of the dictatorial regime in Haiti
October 15-November 1, 1963	Moroccan-Algerian border conflict
December 1963-August 1964	Armed clash between Turkish extremists and Greek police units in Cyprus
February 8-March 30, 1964	Armed clashes on the border between Ethiopia and the Somali Republic
March 28, 1964	Attack by British aircraft on a Yemeni fortress
April 1-2, 1964	Anti-democratic military coup in Brazil
August 5, 1964	Escalation of the armed US intervention against the national liberation movement in Vietnam and beginning of the aggressive actions of US naval and air forces against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam
August 5-10 1964	Aggression by the Turkish air force against Cyprus
April 28, 1965	Armed intervention of the USA against the Dominican Republic
April-June 1965	Armed conflict in the border area between India and Pakistan
August 5, 1965-January 10, 1966	War between India and Pakistan. Cease fire agreement reached as a result of the signing of the Tashkent declaration
February 24, 1966	Military coup in Ghana
June 28, 1966	Military coup in Argentina
April 21, 1967	Reactionary military coup in Greece
June 5, 1967	Israeli aggression against the UAR and other Arab states prepared by the imperialists headed by the USA
October 3, 1968	Military coup in Peru
October 12, 1968	Military coup in Panama. Power seized by a military junta
November 19, 1968	Military coup in the Republic of Mali

July 14, 1969	Armed clash between Salvador and Honduras
September 26, 1969	State coup in Lybia The army overthrew the king and proclaimed the creation of the Lybian Arab Republic
September 1, 1969	Military coup in Bolivia

REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design

Please send your comments to 21, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR